A REPLY TO Mr. GIBBON's VINDICATION OF SOME PASSAGES IN THE Fifteenth and Sixteenth Chapters OF THE HISTORY *of the* DECLINE *and* FALL OF THE *ROMAN EMPIRE.*

CONTAINING

A REVIEW OF THE ERRORS STILL RETAINED IN THESE CHAPTERS.

By JAMES CHELSUM, D.D.

Chaplain to the Honourable and Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of *Wincheſter*; Rector of *Droxford*, *Hants*; and late Student of *Chriſtchurch*, *Oxford*.

——Ut omnes intelligant me non ſtudio accuſare, ſed officio defendere. M. T. Cic. Orat. pro Roſcio.

Nos ipſos redargui refelliq; patiamur, quod ii ferunt animo iniquo, qui certis quibuſdam deſtinatiſq; ſententiis quaſi addicti et conſecrati ſunt. M. T. Cic. Tuſc. Quæſt. L. II. C. V.

WINCHESTER:

PRINTED AND SOLD BY ROBBINS AND GILMOUR.

SOLD ALSO BY T. PAYNE AND SON, MEWS GATE; AND J. ROBSON AND CO. NEW BOND-STREET, LONDON.

M,DCC,LXXXV.

A

REPLY

TO

THE GIBBON'S VINDICATION

OF

SOME PASSAGES

IN THE

Fifteenth and Sixteenth Chapters

OF THE

History of the Decline and Fall

OF THE

ROMAN EMPIRE.

CONTAINING

A Narrative of the Books still Printed in Greek in the Christian Countries.

By JAMES CHELSUM, D.D.

Chaplain to the Honourable and Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Winchester, Rector of Droxford, Hants, and late Student of Christ Church, Oxford.

WINCHESTER:

PRINTED AND SOLD BY J. WILKINS AND OTHERS.

MDCCLXXXV.

ERRATA.

The Reader is earneſtly deſired to correct the following material Errata:

P. 28. l. 12. for Anachreoniſms, *read* Anachroniſms.

P. 96. l. 7. }
P. 98. l. 4. } for impurity, *read* impunity,

ADVERTISEMENT.

BY the word Hiſtory is to be underſtood throughout the following pages, Mr. Gibbon's Hiſtory of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire;—by Vindication, his Vindication of ſome Paſſages of his Hiſtory;—and by Remarks, Dr. Chelſum's Remarks on the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Chapters of Mr. Gibbon's Hiſtory.

A REPLY, &c.

CONTROVERSY is in it's own nature ſo unpleaſant, and attended often with conſequences ſo diſagreeable, that there are few at leaſt of whom it ought to be ſuppoſed that they have entered into it wantonly, and without good reaſon. That common regard which every one pays to his own eaſe and happineſs is in this caſe in general a ſufficient principle of conduct. It is obviouſly adviſeable, in this reſpect alone, to decline debate, and to avoid at once all hazard of provoking the acrimony of diſappointed ambition, and inflaming the fury of ſelfiſh reſentment.

But there are occaſions notwithſtanding, when at the ſacred call of truth, of religious

truth more eſpecially, it becomes a real duty to forego our natural love of peace, and to encounter every danger of active controverſy. Thoſe in particular, who may properly "conſider themſelves as the "Watchmen of the Holy City," [1] are called on by the moſt ſolemn obligations to haſten willingly to it's defence, and to inliſt, not "*in the ſervice of authority*," [2] but in the ſervice of faith and conſcience. It were well if the appointed Miniſters of the Goſpel could be employed only in teaching it's ſalutary doctrines; but it is obvious that the repeated attacks of the opponents of Chriſtianity place them often in a ſituation ſimilar to that of the Jews building up the wall of Jeruſalem. They may not attend to the great buſineſs of Chriſtian Edification alone; but ſince their adverſaries "CONSPIRE TOGETHER TO

[1] Vindication, p. 3.
[2] Vindication, p. 100.

"COME

"COME AND TO FIGHT AGAINST" them, are obliged "WITH ONE HAND TO WORK "IN THE WORK, AND WITH THE OTHER "TO HOLD A WEAPON." [3] I readily acknowledge, therefore, that "I was the "firſt who ſounded to arms, that I was "the firſt who endeavoured to furniſh an "antidote to the poiſon" [4] contained in Mr. Gibbon's Hiſtory. I acknowledge alſo no leſs readily, that after the reſult of my enquiries into the accuracy of our Hiſtorian's quotations, I could not content myſelf with the more prudent plan of leaving unnoticed thoſe errors which I had detected. Had I done this, and confined myſelf to general remarks on the principles of Mr. Gibbon's Hiſtory, had I left him in peaceful poſſeſſion of all thoſe inſufficient ſupports to which my attention had been eſpecially directed, I had perhaps given him

[3] Nehemiah, Ch. IV. v. 8 and 17.
[4] Vindication, p. 99.

little or no offence, and had ſecured to myſelf from others the title of a *liberal* Polemic. I eſteemed it rather a duty altogether incumbent on me to ſtate openly the reſult of my enquiries, and to tread boldly in that dangerous path of Criticiſm in which Mr. Davis [5] afterwards followed me with greater diligence, and on a more extended plan. Having adventured thus imprudently, I have in conſequence met neither with indulgence nor forgiveneſs; have been conſidered by my enraged enemy as entitled to no quarter, and have received the utmoſt chaſtiſement for my heinous offences which the keen ſpirit of his anger has been able to inflict. The event neither wholly ſurprized me, nor found me unprepared.

As I had at firſt aſſigned the real motives which induced me to publiſh my Re-

[5] Some memoirs of Mr. Davis, who died in February 1784, may be found in the Gentleman's Magazine for June 1784.

marks,

marks, [6] I preſume I had a right to be believed even by Mr. Gibbon himſelf; and ought to have been conſidered as acting only from that regard for religion which I had profeſſed. I am repreſented, far differently, but as a kind of literary aſaſſin, as one "deſirous to ruin the credit of his "adverſary;" [7] "as one animated by "an implacable reſentment againſt the "Hiſtorian of the Roman Empire." [8] Even thoſe praiſes alone which I had willingly beſtowed on our Author, [9] might have ſerved ſeemingly to have ſhewn me of a different ſpirit.

The ſame treatment has been extended alſo, in a manner far more unbecoming, to my reſpectable Collegue, who from a love of truth, and a ſincere regard for religion, was led to favour me with a part of my

[6] Remarks, Preface, p. xiii.
[7] Vindication, p. 101.
[8] Ibid.
[9] See Preface, p. xii. &c.

work.

work. But every "Theological Champion" [1] ſeems indeed alike an object of averſion to our Author; and in his Syſtem of Honours, no diſtinctions appear to be reſerved but for the pernicious Philoſopher of modern times, whoſe chief claim to the title conſiſts in his daring to ridicule and deſpiſe the truths which others reverence.

It can be of no importance to others to ſpecify the ſeveral unavoidable obſtacles which for ſome time prevented me from replying to Mr. Gibbon's Vindication, and which have ſince retarded the publication of my Reply, even after the greater part of it had been prepared for the Preſs. It is now my misfortune to have to lament the loſs of my late very reſpectable Colleague, while I commit to the public theſe papers in which frequent mention will be made of him. But he ſtill lives in his own pious labours, his memory ſtill flouriſhes,

[1] Vindication, p. 91.

and

and his name is ſtill juſtly dear to every friend of ſacred literature.

The fame of my Collegue cannot indeed in general ſtand in need of any vindication. Yet I think myſelf bound by very ſtrong ties not to leave unnoticed the attacks which our Author has made upon him in conſequence of the generous aid he beſtowed upon me. And it may ſeem natural for me, nay perhaps in ſome inſtances incumbent on me, not to be inattentive to the attacks made upon myſelf. In reality alſo to perſevere in pointing out the miſtaken aſſertions of a dangerous writer, by ſhewing that they ſtill remain unſupported, and without defence, nay that many are ſtill obſtinately and unfairly retained without even an attempt to defend them, and ſome alſo without the poſſibility of their being defended, is but to appear conſiſtent with myſelf. The intereſts of Religion firſt called forth my endeavours; the ſame intereſts ſeem

now

now to have a farther claim upon me. These reasons have determined me not to withhold the present publication, however, unavoidably, late in it's appearance. In other respects I dismiss my work, not unmindful of that fate which it may in part experience. I know well the cold indifference of many even in the cause of truth, when the question depends on actual examination and inquiry. I know that blind and undistinguishing respect which many pay to an Idol once celebrated. I am aware of that selfish indolence which, in a dissipated age, often seeks only to be amused; but I know also that there are those who are ever active in the search of truth, of religious truth more especially, and who bestow the rich reward of their own solid approbation on those who have laboured humbly with good intentions.

There is a prevailing fallacy, by which the honest cause of religious Controversy has

has often ſuffered, and which imperceptibly, or otherwiſe, the adverſaries of Religion ſeem very generally to have availed themſelves of. The nature of offenſive and defenſive war has been ingeniouſly confounded by reverſing the true appellations; and the name of Polemic, conſidered as a term of reproach, and a mark of a contentious diſpoſition, is beſtowed on thoſe to whom in ſuch ſenſe it by no means belongs, ſince they have not entered the liſts unprovoked, and appear only as defendants in an honourable cauſe, not as litigious plaintiffs in an unneceſſary ſuit.

I am myſelf obviouſly concerned in this remark. I would indeed intreat every candid judge to conſider on the preſent occaſion, whether I am in reality the aſſailant of Mr. Gibbon, becauſe the defendant of Religion, or Mr. Gibbon hiſſelf the aſſailant of Religion.

I cannot but preſume myſelf indeed to

conſider the title of a Polemical Divine as in it's own nature wholly honourable. Then only can the character become diſhonourable, when it is improperly ſuſſtained; when the mode of carrying on the war is diſgraceful, altho' the war itſelf be juſt. I dare again therefore to appear as a Polemic in a good and honourable cauſe; I dare to wage not an offenſive but a defenſive war, a war in no wiſe directed againſt that fame which our Author openly regards as "the moſt valuable object of his hopes;" [2] but deſigned only, as before, to maintain the intereſts of thoſe truths which his aſſertions tend to undermine.

I ſhall attend now to Mr. Gibbon's anſwers to my Remarks according to the order in which they occur in his Vindication. I ſhall premiſe only one general obſervation, in juſtice to my late very reſpec-

[2] Vindication, p. 4.

table

table Collegue. It is particularly incumbent on me to declare, ſince Mr. Gibbon has taken offence at the ſuppoſed expreſſions and "magiſterial tone" [3] of Dr. Randolph, that I alone am anſwerable, throughout my book, for the whole Phraſeology and ſtile of it. In doing this, I have at the ſame time the ſatisfaction of making known more fully than before, how great my obligations were to one who entruſted me with his remarks in the unfiniſhed form of mere private notes, and permitted me afterwards to acknowledge the favour publickly, and to honour my work with his name, without in any ſort examining how I had expreſſed them and arranged them, or what additions I had myſelf made. It was on this account that I ſpake of "*the ſubſtance*" of the Profeſſor's valuable remarks. [4] I may add that the declaration which I have made

[3] Vindication, p. 77, 145, &c.
[4] Preface to Remarks, (2d edit.) p. xiv. (Note 8.)

may ſerve alſo to point out to Mr. Gibbon, ſomewhat more deciſively than his own general aſſertions, the true ſource of that *uniformity* of ſtile at leaſt (ſince it is the ſtile of the *ſame* perſon) which he has commented on, with his uſual *liberality*, as ſubſiſting between Dr. Randolph and myſelf. [5]

The firſt direct notice taken of my remarks relates to the miſrepreſentation of the conduct of Cyprian which I had complained of. [6] Here I had referred to the very Epiſtle on which Mr. Gibbon himſelf

[5] "The two friends are indeed ſo happily united "by art and nature, that if the author of the Remarks "had not pointed out the valuable communications "of the Margaret Profeſſor, it had been impoſſible to "ſeparate their reſpective property. Writers who "poſſeſs any freedom of mind, may be known from "each other by the peculiar character of their ſtile "and ſentiments; but the champions who are en-"liſted in the ſervice of authority, commonly wear "the uniform of the regiment." &c.——Vindication, p. 100.

[6] Remarks, p. 132—139.

grounded

grounded his injurious cenſures of this Prelate, for plain proof of his miſrepreſentation. The anſwer given on this occaſion may probably ſeem ſomewhat extraordinary.— "I ſhall not enter any farther into the "character and conduct of Cyprian, as I "am ſenſible that if the opinion of Le "Clerc, Moſheim, and myſelf, is repro- "bated by Dr. Chelſum and his ally, the "difference muſt ſubſiſt, till we ſhall enter- "tain the ſame notions of moral virtue, and "Eccleſiaſtical power." [7] As our Author has adduced no new reaſons to juſtify his having attributed an unjuſt uſe of Eccleſiaſtical power to Cyprian, in an inſtance which diſplayed in reality a very high regard for moral virtue, "the difference" indeed "muſt ſubſiſt." I alſo ſhall not enter any further into the general character and conduct of Cyprian, not becauſe the opinions of Le Clerc or Moſheim deter me,

[7] Vindication, p. 102.

or

or becauſe I doubt that, on an accurate examination the character of Cyprian might be vindicated on other occaſions alſo, but becauſe I have originally treated of this one inſtance only, as that which our Author had eſpecially choſen to appeal to. I ſhall content myſelf therefore with repeating my aſſertion, that the character of Cyprian is very unjuſtly traduced, and his conduct very erroneouſly and partially ſtated, in Mr. Gibbon's Hiſtory.

The ſame convenient method of diſpatch, and the ſame ſpirit of evaſion, are adopted alſo on ſeveral other occaſions. It ſeems indeed a very general principle with our Author "to decline," as he ſtiles it, the conſideration of many troubleſome objections, in which the credit and value of his hiſtory, and his own reputation in conſequence, are materially concerned. In this manner he has "declined" very commodiouſly "the conſideration of Dr. Watſon's "theo-

" theological arguments ;" [8] and he replies now, that " the dogmatical part" of the remarks of myſelf, and my reſpectable Collegue, " is ill adapted to engage his " attention." [9] But having choſen to introduce into his Hiſtory theological matter, he is in reality, in a profeſſed vindication of himſelf, bound to enter into the conſideration of " theological arguments." And it is not the true queſtion before the public, whether any part of the remarks of his opponents may be " ill adapted to " engage Mr. Gibbon's attention," but whether it can be ſhewn to be ill adapted to the purpoſe for which the remarks were written, that of furniſhing an antidote to the miſtakes and prejudices which abound in his Hiſtory.

The paſſage which preſents itſelf next in order will afford a remarkable inſtance

[8] Vindication, p. 102.
[9] Ibid.

of

of Mr. Gibbon's having again "declined" the conſideration of objections of no trifling moment. It had been remarked that of two paſſages of Irenæus appealed to by our Author in ſupport of his deſcription of the declarations of the Church concerning Tythes, one was obviouſly miſapplied and miſrepreſented, the other proved the very reverſe of what it was alleged to prove; [1] and it had been pointed out that in his appeal to another teſtimony for the ſame purpoſe, a very remarkable omiſſion was obſervable; [2] yet neither the miſapplications in the one caſe, nor the omiſſion in the other, are in any ſort accounted for, or defended. It is urged only with reſpect to the queſtion in general, "that if Dr. Randolph will allow that the "primitive Clergy received, "managed, and diſtributed, the tythes, "and other charitable donations of the

[1] Remarks, p. 120 and 122.
[2] Remarks, p. 122.

"faithful,

" faithful, the diſpute between *us* will be " a diſpute of words." [3] It is plain at leaſt that the circumſtances already alluded to come not within this deſcription. And as to the reſt, however it may readily be allowed, that " the pri- " mitive Clergy received, managed, and " diſtributed the tythes," &c. it can by no means be allowed according to our Author's very bold aſſertion, that " the " public ſtock was entruſted to the care of " the Biſhop *without account or controul.*" [4] And even here therefore neither can the diſpute be a " diſpute of words." The proofs alleged to ſhew that every proper check on the adminiſtration of the Biſhop ſeems to have been enforced, our Author has left wholly unnoticed, as well as the remarks which follow on his own inſufficient proofs of the ſuppoſed wealth of the

[3] Vindication, p. 103.
[4] Hiſtory, Vol. I. Ch. XV. p. 497.

Church. I allude here to a very imperfect and fallacious quotation from a Hymn of Prudentius, [5] to the paſſage quoted from an Epiſtle of Cyprian, [6] and to the Hiſtory of Marcio from Tertullian. [7]

But the cool indifference with which our Author ſpeaks of the errors of his hiſtory in another inſtance is ſtill more remarkable, and more unbecoming. In a queſtion of no ſmall importance, that of the authenticity of the four Goſpels, "a very re-"markable paſſage of Origen," as it is ſtiled, had been quoted, according to his own expoſition of which "that indefatiga-"ble writer, who had conſumed his life in "the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, relies for their "authenticity on the inſpired authority of "the Church." [8] On examining the original, not only the paſſage was found

[5] Remarks, p. 123.
[6] Remarks, p. 124.
[7] Remarks, p. 126.
[8] Hiſtory, &c. Vol. I. Note 34, p. lxvii.

to

to have been altogether erroneouſly ſtated, but the Epithet "*inſpired*" alſo was found to have been inſerted by our Hiſtorian without any authority. [9] Here ſurely, if ever, a correction of the miſtake was at leaſt ſtrictly due. What ſhall we ſay, when no other notice of the whole is taken, than by replying thus? "I ſhall not amuſe "myſelf with proving that the learned "Origen muſt have derived from the *in-* "*ſpired* authority of the Church his know- "ledge, not indeed of the *authenticity*, but "of the *inſpiration* of the *four* Evangeliſts, "*two* of whom are not in the rank of the "Apoſtles." [1] The matter in queſtion certainly is a matter of *ſerious* diſquiſition, if Truth itſelf, if the authenticity of Revelation be ſo. And it behoved our Author in every reſpect to have "amuſed himſelf" either "with proving" or renouncing the

[9] Remarks, p. 35 to 42.
[1] Vindication, p. 103.

validity of his own aſſertion. We may obſerve that our Author has now ſubſtituted the term " *inſpiration*" for " authenticity;" but Origen's own words ſerve equally to prove that he did not derive his knowledge either of the one or the other from " the " *inſpired* authority of the Church." His opinion of the inſpiration of the four Evangeliſts ſeems plainly to come from himſelf.

To another objection indeed a direct and unevaſive anſwer is returned. I had preſumed to aſſert that " the condemnation " of the wiſeſt and moſt virtuous of the " Pagans" is not, as maintained by our Author, " the public doctrine" of the Church of England. It is anſwered, " I " ſhall ſubmit to the judgment of the Pub- " lic, whether the Athanaſian Creed is not " read and received in the Church of Eng- " land, and whether the wiſeſt and moſt " virtuous of the Pagans believed the Ca- " tholic Faith, which is declared in the " Athanaſian

" Athanaſian Creed to be abſolutely neceſ-
" ſary for ſalvation." [2] But this Creed cannot by any equitable or natural rule of interpretation be underſtood to relate at all to Pagans, ſuch as could not HEAR WITHOUT A PREACHER, [3] either before or after the coming of the Goſpel. The Creed was originally compoſed with a view to prevent *Hereſies*; to prevent them among *Chriſtians* therefore, among whom thoſe Hereſies prevailed: It has been adopted by the Church of England likewiſe as a preſervative againſt Hereſy, and neither the introductory declaration therefore, nor any ſubſequent part of it, can fairly be conſidered as relating to the queſtion of the Salvation of the *Pagans*. [4] The introductory

[2] Vindication, p. 103.

[3] Ep. to Romans, x. 14.

[4] I may confirm the propriety of this plain remark by the teſtimony of a very diſintereſted and free-thinking writer. " Every man who is *read in* " *church hiſtory* knows, that belief (the Creed of Atha-

ſentence

ſentence is plainly founded on a ſimilar de-declaration of our Saviour, and muſt be judged of accordingly; and this declaration itſelf was made by Chriſt, at the very time when he commanded his Apoſtles TO GO

" naſius) was drawn up after a long conteſtation with " Arius, concerning the divinity of our bleſſed Sa- " viour, and his being one ſubſtance with the Father; " and that, thus compiled, it was ſent abroad among " the Chriſtian Churches, as a kind of teſt, which " whoſoever took, was looked on as an orthodox be- " liever. 'Tis manifeſt from hence, that *the heathen* " part of the Empire was not concerned in it: for it's " buſineſs was not to diſtinguiſh betwixt *Pagans* and " Chriſtians, but betwixt heretics and true-believers. " This, well conſidered, takes off the heavy weight " of cenſure, which I would willingly avoid, from ſo " venerable a man; for if this propoſition, *Whoſoever* " *will be ſaved*, be reſtrained only to thoſe, to whom " it was intended, and for whom it was compoſed, I " mean the Chriſtians, then the *anathema* reaches not " *the Heathens* who had never heard of Chriſt, and " were nothing intereſted in that diſpute." (Preface to Dryden's Religio Laici.) A ſimilar and very aggravated miſrepreſentation of the 18th Article of our Church in Mr. Hume's Hiſtory may be found noticed in Mr. Gilpin's Life of Cranmer, p. 159.

AND

AND PREACH THE GOSPEL TO EVERY CREATURE, [5] and can relate therefore only to thoſe to whom it ſhould be *preached.* The Church of England ſtill remains therefore unjuſtly cenſured by our Author, in a very material inſtance.

That Mr. Gibbon ſhould ſtill retain his former opinion concerning the conteſted paſſage in Joſephus, may be at leaſt as "*natural*" for him, as he has ſuppoſed it to be for me to embrace the contrary opinion. Mr. Gibbon is at laſt pleaſed to acknowledge that this opinion "is not "deſtitute of able advocates." [6] How far this declaration is conſiſtent with his "rejecting the *interpolation* with *contempt*," [7] I leave to others to determine. I am happy to add now to this liſt of able advocates one whoſe name will indeed do

[5] Mark, xvi. 16.
[6] Vindication, p. 104.
[7] Vindication, p. 103.

much

much credit to it. The Author of the VINDICIÆ FLAVIANÆ, to whom I had offered an humble tribute of praiſe, when as yet unknown, [8] has ſince announced himſelf to be Mr. Bryant. [9] The Advocates for the Authenticity of this remarkable paſſage may again rejoice alſo to find another very able Writer on their ſide, who is not uſed to determine but after the moſt careful and diligent reſearches, and whoſe opinion perhaps, as well as Mr. Bryant's, Mr. Gibbon may treat with the leſs contempt, ſince he is not a profeſſed "Watchman of the "Holy City." [1]

[8] Remarks, p. 184. Note 7.

[9] See the 2d Edition of this valuable Tract.

[1] "Joſephus has given a very particular account "of our Saviour, but not in language applicable to "the preſent enquiry; I ſhould otherwiſe have under-"taken its defence againſt a doubt ſuggeſted that it "is only a forgery."——Inquiry into the Belief of the Chriſtians of the three firſt Centuries, &c. by William Burgh, Eſq. (p. 416. Note.)

The very reſpectable Profeſſor Vernet of Geneva,

Our

Our Author "ſhall not think himſelf "intereſted with reſpect to the paſſages of "Irenæus and Theophilus, which relate to "the gift of Miracles." [2] One may really begin to doubt what it is in which Mr. Gibbon will condeſcend to think himſelf intereſted. I however muſt ſtill preſume to think him intereſted, and that deeply too, in both theſe inſtances. If he thought it poſſible to defend the miſtaken interpretations of Dr. Middleton which he had adopted, he owed it both to the memory of his favourite Author, and to his own reputation, not to decline the queſtion. If he was conſcious that the objections to his own uſe of theſe paſſages were unanſwerable, [3] he owed it both to the cauſe

in the 9th vol. of his excellent work on Chriſtianity, has alſo lately vindicated the authenticity of this paſſage with ſingular learning and induſtry, in the fulleſt and moſt ample manner.

[2] Vindication, p. 103.

[3] Remarks, p. 67—91.

of truth, and to his own reputation, to retract his aſſertions. It is an eaſy and convenient method, I have already had occaſion to remark, but not a ſatisfactory or honourable one, to treat with contempt and indifference objections of an important nature. It behoved Mr. Gibbon as a candid inquirer, in a matter which, we may preſume, he well knew to have been at leaſt controverted, to have conſulted the adverſaries of Dr. Middleton as well as Dr. Middleton himſelf. I ſeem at once juſtified in concluding that he did not conſult them, from his own contemptuous inſinuation. It would not have coſt him that "*diligent* "*ſearch to diſcover ſome remains of their* "*writings*," [4] which he is pleaſed to think neceſſary. They may be found extant in many libraries, in the reſpectable collections more eſpecially of the grave and conſci-

[4] Vindication, p. 104.

entious

entious advocates of Religion, if not indeed in thoſe of it's opponents.

The hypotheſis, which I ſtated merely as *ſuch*, reſpecting an earlier date than the received one of the age of Herodotus, Mr. Gibbon has ſhewn from the paſſage in Aulus Gellius, and by his accurate compariſon of the ſeveral dates, to be wholly indefenſible. Had I made the ſame compariſon, the means of which lie open to every one, I could not have failed of arriving at the ſame concluſion. But not meaning in any ſort to make myſelf anſwerable for the particular patronage of this opinion, but throwing it out merely as it caſually preſented itſelf, I did not uſe any particular reſearches, and do not now therefore conſider myſelf as in reality at all concerned in all that ſtudied parade of triumph, and perſonal retort, in which Mr. Gibbon has ſo eagerly indulged himſelf. As little do I think myſelf called on to gratify his

" curioſity," by giving up to the ſeverity of his judgment other authors who have too haſtily adopted the ſame conjecture.

But I have fallen alſo into " a poſitive " miſtake much leſs excuſable." [5] In a moment of inadvertence I aſſociated together, with reſpect to Suidas, very improperly and erroneouſly, the once-connected ideas of *Greek* and *Heathen*. Were it not an invidious and ungenerous employment, it would not be a difficult taſk to ſelect inſtances of many palpable Anachreoniſms, and other occaſional miſtakes, even out of authors of great note. The acute Bentley himſelf was not always accurate; and argues, that " if a miſtake through mere " forgetfulneſs, and but once or very ſel- " dom committed, were enough to diſ- " grace a writer, nobody could eſcape " the infamy, except thoſe that were in-

[5] Vindication, p. 105.

" ſpired,"

" ſpired." [6] I will borrow the words which he has uſed to his own adverſary. " I ſhall not go about to make the glory " leſs" which Mr. Gibbon has acquired, " but give him and his admirers leave to " magnify it as much as they can." [7] It were cruel indeed to attempt in any ſort to deprive Mr. Gibbon of the accidental triumph he has obtained in reſpect of this *ſingle* inſtance of miſtake in " literary hiſ- " tory." [8] He had been employed ſeemingly far more ſuitably and conſiſtently in endeavouring to anſwer thoſe objections reſpecting the matter in queſtion, with regard to which he has been altogether ſilent.

[6] Diſſertation upon Phalaris, p. 420.

[7] Ibid, p. 421.

[8] Vindication, p. 105.——Had Mr. Gibbon been his Antagoniſt, Dr. Bentley hiſſelf might have been accuſed, in the ſame ſpirit of remark, of not having even " a very moderate acquaintance with that uſeful " branch of knowledge," modern Geography.—Dr. Bentley (Diſ.p. 420) acknowledges himſelf," by a ſmall " ſlip of the memory to have put Buda for Belgrade."

But

But if he found this a taſk too difficult, it was indeed fortunate for him, ſince it afforded him at leaſt the unworthy conſolation of revenge, to have been able to diſcover, however unable to ſave himſelf from the diſgrace of his own wounds, one unguarded place in his adverſary, at which he might aim a blow. I need only add that although it muſt indeed be concluded that Suidas was not a Heathen, this only in part affects my obſervation on Dr. Middleton's appeal to him. The *propriety* and *conſiſtency* of ſeeking for ſupport in his aſſertions concerning either *Jewiſh* or *Chriſtian* Prophets, from a teſtimony which relates only to *Heathen* Prophets, remains ſtill to be vindicated; [9] as well as the miſapplication of the paſſages of Philo and Tertullian on the ſame ſubject. [1]

On another occaſion I lament ſincerely an overſight which Mr. Gibbon hiſſelf

[9] Remarks, p. 73.
[1] Ibid.

firſt

firſt pointed out to me. He had a right certainly to complain of my having aſſerted that he had only in part appealed to the teſtimony of Dion concerning the perſecution under Domitian, when he has in reality produced the whole teſtimony. He had *not* a right however to impute to me, as he has done, the moſt baſe and diſhonourable motives, ſuch as beſpeak even a want of common honeſty, when the true ſource of the miſtake could not be certainly known to any one but myſelf. He had *not* a right to accuſe me of a very heinous crime on ſuppoſition only. When he in effect pronounces without heſitation the miſtake in queſtion to have been owing to *deſign*; when he at once aſſerts boldly that "Dr. Chelſum "has not been deterred *by the fear of de-* "*tection* from this ſcandalous mutilation (ſcandalous indeed it would be had it "been from deſign) "of the popular "work of a living adverſary;" [2] he is

[2] Vindication, p. 109.

guilty

guilty of a degree of illiberality, which, I am willing to think, he muſt in his cooler moments bluſh to recollect. It may be added ſeemingly, that the accuſation alſo, could I not at once with the pureſt conſcience ſolemnly declare it deſtitute of all foundation, may be ſhewn to contain in itſelf the ſtrongeſt evidence of it's own improbability. Had I indeed been of that abandoned and enterpriſing ſpirit which Mr. Gibbon has attributed to me, ſhould I have been contented with a deſigned miſrepreſentation of his work in this *one* inſtance only, (and his own ſilence may prove ſufficiently that there are not more inſtances of the kind to be found) or can it be ſuppoſed that in this inſtance I could have hoped to eſcape "*detection*," could have hoped that in ſo remarkable a caſe, our Author ſhould not have recollected his own words?

But

But Mr. Gibbon was already engaged in a charge of mutilation againſt Origen, and in the habit, as it ſeems, imperceptibly at leaſt, of attributing diſingenuous practices to others, without any actual proof. This accuſation, which Mr. Gibbon has attempted to juſtify, I muſt again condemn as equally uncandid and ill-ſupported.

"Celſus," it is preſumed, "although "he might ſupport error by ſophiſtry, "would not write nonſenſe in his own lan-"guage." [3] May I not reply, that it is at leaſt equally probable that Origen, if he did mutilate the objections of his adverſary (to admit for the preſent a ſuppoſition which in reality cannot be admitted) would yet mutilate them with ſome degree of attention to appearances, with ſome ſmall air of probability, would not at leaſt convert them into "nonſenſe?"

[3] Vindication, p. 111.

But to ſay that the paſſage is wholly unintelligible, to intimate that "the deſign "and purport" [4] of it cannot be comprehended, ſeems after all too bold an aſſertion. It is certainly difficult and obſcure, yet this may ſeemingly be collected from it, that the objection of Celſus tended to accuſe the Chriſtians of having bragged that they would bring over one after another all Princes to their own paſſive opinion, a boaſt which Origen denies ever to have been made. And the latter part of the objection ſeems intended to point out further what would at laſt be the probable conſequence even to the Chriſtians theirſelves of the ſpreading of ſuch doctrines. May not the obſcurity itſelf of the paſſage, whatever it may be thought to be, be much more probably accounted for by attributing it to the effect of time, and to thoſe common injuries which moſt books of re-

[4] Vindication, p. 111 and 112.

mote

mote antiquity have in ſome degree experienced? The French Tranſlator, Bouhereau, ſince in his Notes he has made ſeveral emendations of Spencer's verſion of this paſſage, conſidered it ſurely as a paſſage out of which ſome ſenſe might be extracted.

The "ambiguity" of which I am accuſed in the ſevereſt terms (not without a very liberal inſinuation againſt "the modern "divine" [5] in general) was at leaſt not intended. It was my deſign to be underſtood to ſpeak of Origen's denial of the truth of Celſus's aſſertion, merely with reſpect to the particular paſſage which has juſt been diſcuſſed. Had I perceived that my "ſtate of the queſtion" was in any degree capable of another different ſort of interpretation, ſuch as our Author objects, it would have been my earneſt ſtudy to have avoided all "ambiguity of language." I am not therefore called on to attempt "to

[5] Vindication, p. 112.

" juſtify either to the world, or to my own " feelings, the abuſe which I have made of " the privileges even of the Gymnaſtic " ſtyle." [6] Were I, I ſhould indeed think the attempt vain in both reſpects. And I ſhall here take the opportunity of diſclaiming utterly, once for all, the uſe of thoſe privileges which our Author is willing to allow. Even Mr. Gibbon himſelf cannot hold the character of the mere Controverſialiſt, the profeſſed *Gymnaſtic*, in more contempt and abhorrence than he whom he ſuppoſes to have availed himſelf of " the privileges of the Gymnaſtic ſtyle." Conſcious as I am of theſe ſentiments, and of having in no ſort intended " the ſtrange " ambiguity" our Author has accuſed me of, I ſeem to have a right to complain myſelf of his having imputed to me, without abſolute proof, ſo mean an artifice as that of a deſigned ambiguity of ſtyle for the

[6] Vindication, p. 112.

pur-

purpoſe of ſecuring to myſelf a falſe and unjuſt triumph.

That Origen repreſents himſelf and ſome other Chriſtians as not engaging in war, even at the command of their Sovereign, as I from the firſt never meant to deny, ſo I now readily acknowledge. Nor have I indeed at all maintained, according to Mr. Gibbon's erroneous ſtate of my aſſertions, that neither "Origen in theory, or Marcellus in prac-"tice, could ſeriouſly object to the uſe of "arms; *becauſe* it is well known that," &c. [7] The words alluded to form a diſtinct and previous ſentence by theirſelves, relative only to the general queſtion of military ſervice, and not to the *particular* opinions either of Origen, or Marcellus, thus. "It "is well known that far from declining "the buſineſs of war altogether, whole "Legions of Chriſtians ſerved in the Im-

[7] Vindication, p. 120.

"perial

" perial armies." [8] The word " *becauſe*," by which this ſentence has been erroneouſly connected with other words, however it has by Mr. Gibbon's too haſty miſconception been quoted as mine, is in reality wholly of his own invention and inſertion. As little do thoſe other words theirſelves belong to me, as I have already remarked. Mr. Gibbon ſeems both to have made me, undeſignedly, ſpeak a language which I never ſpake, and to have overlooked entirely the following expreſs words, in which I acknowledge, " that it cannot be diſputed that *ſome* of " the firſt Chriſtians were averſe to the " buſineſs of war and government." [9] In fact the " Theory" of Origen came not at all under my diſcuſſion, I having ſpoken of him only in reference to the charge of mutilation brought againſt him. And in treating of the Hiſtory of Marcellus, I

[8] Remarks, p. 113.
[9] Remarks, p. 111.

treated

treated of it only with reſpect to our Author's omiſſion of a material part of it.

But reſpecting my general aſſertion itſelf concerning the military ſervice of the Chriſtians, I now perceive the imprudence of having accidentally uſed a looſe and indefinite, though not uncommon, mode of expreſſion. Had I ſpoken of great multitudes, inſtead of "whole legions," to which I alone meant the expreſſion to be equivalent, but by no means to denote *diſtinct Chriſtian Legions*, however it may certainly bear that ſenſe, that brilliant triumph of my adverſary, in which he ſo peculiarly exults, had ſeemingly of neceſſity been precluded. I have now only a plain tale to offer in reply, premiſing at the ſame time that as the whole ſentence in queſtion, both as to matter and expreſſion, was mine alone, I alone, and not my late reſpectable Collegue alſo, am "the Eceleſiaſtical Pompey".

pey" [1] concerned in it. Mr. Gibbon may be told that I never at all meant, in the ſenſe in which he has taken my expreſſion, to attempt to raiſe "out of the earth any "armed men," [2] and that I am not therefore tied to either of the horns of his Dilemma; am neither at all engaged to undertake the defence of the Thebæan or Thundering Legions, nor "to acquieſce" under any, even the leaſt "diſhonourable imputation." Had my expreſſion been more accurate and limited, the whole of our Author's lively imagery had ſeemingly been for ever loſt to the world, nay even that unſupported and *moſt truly liberal* aſſertion that I "muſt acquieſce under ſome impu-"tations which are *better underſtood than* "*expreſſed*," [3] ſhould I not undertake to defend two Hiſtories in reality not at all

[1] Vindication, p. 120.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

alluded

alluded to, could perhaps have found no place.

The real queſtion thus far cleared, I may now ſeemingly, without incurring again the ſame danger of being miſunderſtood, return to the defence of my poſition, that great multitudes of Chriſtians ſerved in the Imperial armies. That very charitable allowance which Mr. Gibbon has made, though, as he declares, with his uſual delicacy of expreſſion, "he has not diſcovered in the "Author of the Remarks many traces of "a clear and enlightened underſtanding," [4] is not in fact miſplaced. I am willing to conſider this declaration as relating to myſelf only, though in reality made of "the Author *or* Authors," becauſe I cannot but look upon the illiberality of it as greatly heightened when applied to my late very reſpectable Collegue. Our Author has indeed conjectured rightly when he is

[4] Vindication, p. 120.

pleaſed to declare that "he cannot ſuppoſe "me ſo deſtitute of every reaſoning prin- "ciple as to imagine that I here allude to "the conduct of the Chriſtians who em- "braced the profeſſion of arms after their "religion had obtained a public eſtabliſh- "ment." [5]

But that the Chriſtians in general before this period were not uſeleſs members of ſociety, in declining altogether the calls of neceſſary and lawful war, as originally aſ- ſerted by Mr. Gibbon, a variety of evidence is afforded us. The very purport and occa- ſion of Tertullian's treatiſe itſelf de Coronâ, as well as the expreſs words "inter *tot* "fratres commilitones," prove that it was uſual for Chriſtians to ſerve in the armies; and that well-known and remarkable paſ- ſage in his Apologeticus, tending to vindi- dicate, in very ſpirited terms, the character of the Chriſtians in general from the impu-

[5] Vindication, p. 120.

tation

tation of being uſeleſs citizens, exhibits a ſtrong and poſitive teſtimony that they engaged in war. Euſebius alſo may be appealed to as ſpeaking in more than one place of thoſe *ſoldiers* who in the time of perſecution laid aſide their character and embraced a private life, rather than ſacrifice to Idols; [6] and of others alſo who were driven out of the cities. [7]

Whenever indeed the fact is ſtated differently, the opinions and practice of a few only are improperly confounded with the contrary conduct of a greater number. There are thoſe who profeſſing themſelves Chriſtians, maintain the unlawfulneſs of war even in theſe days, and there have been others in late times alſo of ſimilar ſentiments; but it is obvious how deceitful that Hiſtory would be, which, in conſequence

[6] H. E. L. VIII. C. IV. & de vitâ Conſtantini L. II. C. 33.

[7] H. E. L. X. C. VIII.

either of their declarations or their practice, ſhould ſpeak of ſuch Chriſtians without due diſtinction. We cannot ſeemingly be any more juſtified in conſidering the declarations of Individuals as containing the avowed ſentiments of the Church itſelf. Even thoſe two Fathers, whoſe ſentiments are particularly inſiſted on, Tertullian and Origen, appear ſcarcely conſiſtent with themſelves, and have in ſome parts of their works advanced opinions which ſeem to allow of the practice of war. [8] It has

[8] " Ipſi illi qui ceteroquin bellum plane deteſtari videntur, aliis tamen in locis mitius exiſtimant. Tertullianus qui libro de coronâ militis tot argumentis, at magnam partem infirmis bellantes aggreditur, in Apologetico tamen minus longe vehemens eſt. " Na- " vigamus et nos vobiſcum, et militamus." (C. XLII.) Tum temporis igitur nefarium haud duxit cum Deorum cultoribus militare.

" Idem fere de Origene dicere licet. Non ſatis ille ſibi conſtat, moxque militiam execrari, mox certis ſub conditionibus permittere videtur. (Vide quæ col- legit ex eo Wetſtenius Notis ad Dialogum Origenis

been

been conjectured, from the number of Chriſtians who appear to have ſerved in the Roman armies, at leaſt towards the cloſe of the ſecond, and in the third century, that ſome indulgences muſt have been ſhewn in their favour with reſpect to ſuch conditions as would otherwiſe have reſtrained them from entering into the army; [9] and

contra Marcionitas, p. 27, 28.) Equidem in hanc ſententiam pæne venio partem hanc doctrinæ moralis veterum Chriſtianorum, minori adhuc, quam neceſſe eſt, diligentiâ explicatam eſſe, *paucoſq.* tantum eorum ſimpliciter & abſolute bellum omne rejeciſſe.

" Quicquid porro reſpondeat Origenes Celſo, alio tamen in loco (Lib. IV. p. 217, edit. Spencer) videtur concedere bella legitime geri poſſe."

(Moſhemii Diſſertationum ad ſanctiores diſciplinas pertinentium Syntagma. Quo. Lipſiæ 1732, p. 654 & 655.)

[9] " Dubio caret, ſub exitum ſaltem ſæculi ſecundi et tertio ſæculo *multos* Chriſtianos in copiis Romanis militâſſe. Hos omnes officii ſui fuiſſe adeo immemores ut per Deos et genium Imperatonis jurarent, variis de cauſſis incredibile eſt. Nec tamen aliis legibus res

Moyle

Moyle himſelf acknowledges that there were Chriſtian ſoldiers in the third century. It may be added, that the Hiſtory of the Thundering Legion, as related by Euſebius, and continued by Tertullian, whether it be deemed true or falſe, at leaſt ſeems to imply neceſſarily that a great number of Chriſtians ſerved at that time in the Roman armies. Had there been none, or only a few, in the ſervice of the Empire, had Chriſtians in general thought the military ſervice unlawful, the ſtory muſt have been ſeen to be at once fundamentally deſtitute of all probability, and muſt therefore have been thought too abſurd and too manifeſtly falſe to be at all inſiſted on. We can ſcarce

militaris Romana tum regebatur quam antea. Igitur neceſſe eſt viam quandam patuiſſe Chriſtianis militibus intrandi in exercitum ſine ſuperſtitioſo ejuſmodi ac impio ſacramento, qualiſcunq. demum illa fuerit."
(Moſhemii Diſſertationum ad ſanctiores diſciplinas pertinentium Syntagma. Quo. Lipſiæ & Gorlitzii. 1732, p. 701.)

indeed

indeed in ſuch caſe ſuppoſe that it ever would have been related.

"We are ignorant," it is juſtly obſerved, "of the adventures and character of the "Centurion Marcellus, how long he had "conciliated the profeſſion of arms and of "the Goſpel, whether he was only a Cate-"chumen, or whether he was initiated by "the Sacrament of Baptiſm." [1] And much therefore cannot be deduced on either ſide, reſpecting the preſent queſtion as to the Chriſtians in general, from the ſingle inſtance of his hiſtory. Yet ſurely from the remarkable words "if the condition of "*ſoldiers* is ſuch that they are compelled "to ſacrifice," &c. [2] we may be allowed to infer with great probability, that there were at that time *Chriſtian* Soldiers in the army, ſince it were abſurd to ſuppoſe him to complain of other ſoldiers being "*com-*"*pelled*" to ſacrifice.

[1] Vindication, p. 115.
[2] Remarks, p. 116.

Re-

Reſpecting Mr. Gibbon's defence of his ſtate of this hiſtory, it is at leaſt no defence of that omiſſion of a very important circumſtance in it, which I objected to. Whether the conduct of Marcellus, conſidered as a ſoldier only, be in reality altogether juſtifiable or not, whether his pious zeal did or did not exceed the proper bounds of military ſubmiſſion, is not at leaſt the original queſtion between us. In any caſe to have omitted that Marcellus *at the very time* when he publickly renounced his profeſſion had found himſelf commanded publickly to offer ſacrifice, neceſſarily renders our Hiſtorian's narrative materially defective and unfavourable to the memory of this pious Centurion. Suppoſe an Hiſtorian to relate the caſe of a Proteſtant Officer in the ſervice of a Popiſh Prince, who ſhould have quitted the ſervice in conſequence of having been called on to join in an act of worſhip which his con-

conſcience diſapproved. Whatever opinion might be entertained of his conduct, conſidered as an Officer, were the Hiſtorian to omit wholly *the reaſon* of his renouncing his profeſſion, we could not ſurely conſider ſuch a narrative as either adequate or impartial. In this reſpect I muſt ſtill condemn our Author's repreſentation of the Story of Marcellus. I muſt add, ſince it reſpects an inſinuation levelled at myſelf, that whether "the pronoun *your* has" or has not, in the opinion of "a lawyer or military man, a ſeditious or even treaſonable import," [3] no cenſure ought to fall on me for not having "thought proper to "tranſlate" [4] the words "Imperatoribus "veſtris." I have not *tranſlated* (which Mr. Gibbon ſeemingly ſhould not have failed to obſerve) even any part of the *whole ſentence* in which theſe words are

[3] Vindication, p. 119.
[4] Vindication, p. 118.

contained, as not in reality belonging to the purport of my remark; but I have ſubjoined in the Note [5] the whole ſentence in the *original* words, as preceding that which I was alone concerned to inſiſt on particularly. Had I aimed at any ſtudied concealment, according to our Author's inſinuation, ſurely I ſhould have kept the ſentence in the *original* alſo out of ſight.

If I have to complain of an illiberal and ill-grounded ſuſpicion in this and other inſtances, I have ſtill more reaſon for complaint with reſpect to Mr. Gibbon's fallacious ſtate of my vindication of Euſebius. The force of Mr. Gibbon's very lively talents for ridicule and irony, exerted in an arbitrary and partial repreſentation even of the plaineſt and moſt innocent aſſertions of his Antagoniſt, and the rich luxuriancy of his fancy, may be diſcovered indeed on other occaſions. It is thus that he magni-

[5] Remarks, p. 116.

fies

fies the mere mention of his "diſtruſt of "the Fathers" [6] into "a grave and pathetic complaint;" [7] it is thus that a plain appeal in favour of Euſebius, expreſſed in the words "Let us at leaſt hear "him in his own defence before we utterly "condemn him," [8] and in theſe only, is repreſented as "a moſt lamentable exclamation;" [9] that a mere calm and ſober ſtrain of remarks is very unjuſtly conſtrued into "anger and clamour," [1] and "a magiſterial tone" is complained of, [2] where the impartial reader will certainly diſcover no traces of aſſumed authority. But the full force of theſe treacherous talents ſeems to have been reſerved altogether for the ſingle article of my de-

[6] Preface to Remarks, p. ii.
[7] Vindication, p. 127.
[8] Vindication, p. 122.
[9] Vindication, p. 127.
[1] Vindication, p. 139.
[2] Vindication, p. 143.

fence of Euſebius. Where indeed Reaſon cannot ſafely be truſted as an advocate, no other reſource is left than to recur to the weapons of Ridicule.

Were my Arguments in defence of Euſebius really to be judged of by Mr. Gibbon's ſtate of them, I ſhould readily acknowledge even more than he hiſſelf has ſaid, ſhould readily confeſs that my Apologies are more than "almoſt inconſiſtent," [3] and that my "ſeveral fortifications, inſtead of not "exactly ſupporting each other," [4] are altogether badly conſtructed, and do not anſwer each their proper ends. But while I entreat my Reader to attend only to a few plain Truths diſcernible at once from a bare inſpection of my remarks, I am obliged to fill up our Author's conciſe aſſertions with ſuch additions as may ſerve eaſily to refute the fallacies which they

[3] Vindication, p. 143.
[4] Vindication, p. 127.

contain,

contain, and to ſtate fairly what I really have maintained. It may not juſtly be ſaid that " the advocate for the ſincerity of " Euſebius maintains, 1ſt, that he (Euſe- " bius) never made ſuch a declaration," [5] but that he maintains his never having made *ſuch a declaration as Mr. Gibbon has attributed to him*; nor, 2dly, that he maintains " that he had a right to make *it*," [6] (namely the declaration made for him by Mr. Gibbon himſelf) but only that he maintains that Euſebius had a right to make the declaration which he really has made; nor, 3dly, " that he did not obſerve *it*," [7] namely his own declaration, (or, as it is wittily ſtated in another place, " that he " ſaved his honour by not keeping his " word") [8] but, that having obſerved in general his *declared* plan of commemorating

[5] Vindication, p. 127.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Vindication, p. 136.

rather

rather the virtues than the faults of the Chriſtians, he has yet in ſome particular inſtances, by "lamenting forcibly the cor-"ruption of manners and principles" prevalent among them, ſhewn plainly that he was not altogether ſtudious to conceal the faults of his brethren any further than the plan which he had laid down to hiſſelf, and which he had openly avowed, did not require or engage for the inſertion of them. It is preſumed that *theſe* three ſeveral fortifications, thus truly laid down according to the *real* plan, may ſtill be of ſome uſe in repelling the enemy; nor does that "very muddy ſoil" in which Mr. Gibbon has been pleaſed to ſink "my entrenchments," [9] according to his own ſportive fancy, if the original deſigner may indeed be allowed to judge at all of the ground he hiſſelf has taken, exiſt any where but in his own imagination. He ſeems indeed

[9] Vindication, p. 127.

to

to have reconnoitred the ground under the influence of a very ſtrong prejudice as to the weakneſs of his antagoniſt's entrenchments; and it need not therefore be wondered at ſhould their ſtrength be found at laſt far ſuperior to that which he has attributed to them, in his own partial report.

1. In the firſt inſtance indeed I muſt ſtill deny that Mr. Gibbon has given the true ſenſe and meaning of that declaration on which he founds ſo heavy a cenſure upon Euſebius, or diſcharged the duties of "a "fair Interpreter," while he has "reduced "the ſpirit and ſubſtance" of the two paſſages [1] in which the Hiſtorian hiſſelf has

[1] Mr. Gibbon has been pleaſed to remark (Vindication, p. 129) that I have "not thought proper to "tranſlate the ſplendid Epithet" of the original, in one of theſe paſſages, and have ſaid "a Hiſtory of "Martyrs" inſtead of "a Hiſtory of *wonderful* Mar-"tyrs." The omiſſion was, I believe, owing to accident, and mere overſight; moſt certainly not to artifice. I am perfectly willing to reſtore the Epithet,

pre-

premiſed that "*it does not agree with his* "*plan* to relate the diſſenſions and wicked- "neſs of the Chriſtians," and that he "ſhall only add thoſe things which may "be *profitable*" to his own age, "and to "poſterity," into this conciſe, and ſelf-condemning declaration, "that he has related whatever might redound to the *glory*, and *ſuppreſſed* all that could tend to the diſgrace of Religion." Where indeed are there to be found in Euſebius hiſſelf any expreſſions really equivalent to thoſe in the latter part of this diſguiſed ſentence? On the other hand both Euſebius's open declaration of his own aſſumed plan, which, I muſt ſtill think, in reality in a great meaſure includes his juſtification, and the reaſons which he has aſſigned for the adoption of ſuch a plan, from the ſuppoſed

and being fully convinced of the propriety of the term, think no reflection can fall on Euſebius for the uſe of it.

"pro-

" profitableneſs" of it, on which his juſtification again further depends, are in Mr. Gibbon's *reduced* tranſlation of the two paſſages in queſtion wholly omitted. This method of reduction is indeed admirably compendious, and may perhaps be eſteemed convenient; but if it muſt be thought eſſential in accuſations where the good repute of others is at ſtake to exhibit the reaſons of their conduct, to exhibit the whole of their declarations, it will hardly be pronounced fair and lawful.

2. I muſt ſtill alſo dare to think as before, that Euſebius had a right to chooſe his own plan; had a right to compoſe a Panegyric, ſhould we indeed agree to call it ſo, rather than a complete Hiſtory, while he believes, as he aſſerts, that ſuch a plan would prove moſt profitable both to his contemporaries and to poſterity. Nor am I indeed at all " frightened," according to " the unexpected conſequence" which Mr.

Gibbon has attempted to deduce, leſt my defence of "the choice of Euſebius ſhould "fix an indirect cenſure on the unreſerved "ſincerity of the four Evangeliſts," [2] ſince this boaſted conſequence in reality by no means follows from it's premiſſes. It cannot be juſtly argued that the Evangelical Hiſtorians deſerve cenſure even "indirectly," becauſe Euſebius is, as I have maintained, excuſable, unleſs it muſt be deemed a fault to *inſert* what it *may* be lawful, for particular declared reaſons, to *omit*. Theſe two caſes are evidently altogether diſtinct, and independent each on the other. I preſumed to think Euſebius's plan "*perhaps* peculiarly proper," in reſpect of the ſpirit of piety which it might ſerve to inſpire by the Hiſtorian's inſiſting *principally* (for I muſt again remind Mr. Gibbon that he has not wholly omitted what yet his declared plan did not call on

[2] Vindication, p. 133.

him

him particularly to inſert) on ſo many illuſtrious examples of martyrdom. The qualifying term " perhaps" is not noticed by Mr. Gibbon; yet it might have ſerved to ſhew him plainly that I was not wholly eager and poſitive in my aſſertion; whence ground is again wanting even for our Author's " indirect" conſequence. Altogether I am not certainly at all affected by thoſe expreſſions of triumph which nothing leſs ſurely than a detection of the moſt *direct* and moſt abſurd conſequence could in any ſort have juſtified, but which are now found to be ſupported only by a palpable fallacy, and neglect of due diſtinction on his own part, and which in reality are ſo illiberal, as to be ſeemingly incapable of juſtification in any caſe, and to be wholly unworthy notice. My own faith has never been in any danger in conſequence of my defence of Euſebius; and I have only to rejoice that Mr. Gibbon hiſſelf is ſo fully and

juſtly ſenſible of the force of that internal evidence which is derivable from "the "unreſerved ſincerity of the four Evan-"geliſts."

With reſpect to my differing in opinion as to the lawfulneſs of Euſebius's plan, from Baronius and Tillemont, (in conſequence of which the lively pen of our Author has delineated me, as "leſs ſincere "than a Cardinal, and more obſtinate than "a Janſeniſt" [3]) let me remind Mr. Gibbon, that ſincerity conſiſts in ſpeaking according to our real ſentiments, whatever they may be. In this reſpect I have not been inſincere; and Mr. Gibbon, not having

[3] Vindication, p. 136.—I am unhappily at a loſs to recollect what that "former inſtance" is to which Mr. Gibbon alludes in the beginning of this ſentence, when he accuſes me of having "appeared to be more "credulous than a Monk;" and no reference being given, I am not therefore, as I could wiſh, able to meet the accuſation. But the whole ſatire will be thought perhaps to be in reality more the concern of Monks, Cardinals, and Janſeniſts, than of myſelf.

even

even attempted to prove that I have, ſeems to have attended far more to wit than argument, to ſatire than to liberality of ſentiment, in preſuming to allege the ſuppoſition. And I would only wiſh to add further, in reſpect of my ſtill differing in opinion from theſe writers, in Mr. Gibbon's own words, that "as long as I "have (as I preſume to think that I have in the preſent caſe) "truth on my ſide, "I am not eaſily daunted by the names "of the moſt eminent men." [4]

3. With regard to the paſſage in Euſebius which I appealed to as a caſe in point, in oppoſition to the general character of him given by our Author, I muſt obſerve that his opinion of it, ſince he hiſſelf firſt quoted it, is very remarkably changed. He ſurely at firſt conſidered the paſſage as containing matter of no ſmall weight and importance, when in reſpect to "the con-

[4] Vindication, p. 72.

"ruption

"ruption of manners and principles ſo "*forcibly* lamented by Euſebius," [5] he added that the reader who ſhould conſult the original would not accuſe him of having heightened the picture, [6] when he copied the principal features of the picture with an evident degree of minute and particular attention, and inſerted the copy as a ſtriking repreſentation of the manners of the times in the body of his hiſtory. [7] The nature of this paſſage is ſince on a ſudden altogether changed; it contains now only "a "ſtrain of *looſe* and *indefinite* cenſure, "which ſeems to have no fixed object, or "certain aim." [8] But are not ſuch general and compendious narratives common to Hiſtory, and received uſually as carrying with them a determinate meaning? That

[5] Ch. XVI. p. 564.
[6] Hiſtory, Vol. I. Note 134. p. lxxiv.
[7] Vol. I. Ch. XVI. p. 564.
[8] Vindication, p. 136 & 137.

the

the narrative in queſtion is really "looſe "and indefinite," and has "no certain aim," is not readily to be allowed. If it were indeed in fact thus nugatory and impoſing, if it were only the mere ſemblance without the reality of Hiſtory, it is altogether extraordinary that Mr. Gibbon ſhould at firſt have honoured it with ſuch particular attention, and ſhould have appealed to the original, to prove that he had not *heightened* his own picture. A candid peruſal of the Chapter itſelf [9] will furniſh it's beſt defence; and he who remarks with what ſerioufneſs the Hiſtorian comments on the degeneracy of his brethren in the times preceding that perſecution, which he fuppoſes to have followed as a divine judgment, in how ſcriptural a ſtile he laments the protection of the Lord juſtly withdrawn from his people, will be perhaps ſomewhat aſtoniſhed that the whole narrative ſhould

[9] Euſebii H. E. L. VIII. Cap. I.

at

at laſt have been treated with no ſmall degree of contemptuous levity, and explained and illuſtrated by a quotation from the Tartuffe of Moliere. To ſay that the plan of Euſebius's narrative is owing to "prudence," [1] to ſtudied artifice and diſſimulation is to put upon it a very forced and unnatural conſtruction, is to *ſuppoſe* only what is not in any degree *proved*, is to affix an imputation of a very heinous nature to the character of the Hiſtorian, with a ſpirit of inconſiderate wantonneſs which has been exerted in another inſtance ſtill more cruelly and inexcuſably. [2]

I find myſelf ſo powerfully ſupported, and my own ground of defence ſo exactly taken by a very reſpectable Author [3]

[1] Vindication, p. 138.

[2] See hereafter, reſpecting Note 181, p. lxxxvii. Hiſtory, Vol. I.

[3] The anonymous tranſlator of the account of "the Martyrs at Smyrna and Lyons in the ſecond "Century"—"the Octavius of Minucius Felix"—

ſince

ſince the publication of my remarks, that I cannot forbear tranſcribing a part of his vindication of Euſebius from the ſevere and unjuſt ſtrictures of Mr. Gibbon.

" The fair meaning of Euſebius is, that the purpoſe of his work was, to deſcribe the virtues of the Martyrs, and their admirable conſtancy under ſufferings.

" Had Euſebius undertaken to write a hiſtory of the corruptions prevalent in the Chriſtian Church at the æra of the great and laſt perſecution, and had he written it in an imperfect or partial manner, he might have been accuſed " of the violation

and of the very hiſtory in queſtion, Euſebius's Hiſtory of the Martyrs in Paleſtine, with explanatory Notes, 3 vols. 12mo. Edinburgh, 1776, 1780, and 1781. It is to be lamented that theſe publications ſhould be anonymous, ſince both the name of the Author, and his high judicial ſtation in a neighbouring part of the kingdom, (for neither is this able and active defender of Chriſtianity one of the appointed " Watchmen of the Holy City") could not fail to give weight to his labours.

" of one of the great laws of hiſtory;" and it would have made no difference whether he had *confeſſed* his purpoſe of giving an imperfect or partial account, or whether his readers had detected his prevarication and bad faith; unleſs, perhaps, it might be ſaid, that he who acknowledges his intention of "*ſuppreſſing*" the truth, is leſs culpable than he who ſuppreſſes it under ſpecious proteſtations of impartiality.

" But Euſebius did *not* undertake to write a hiſtory of the corruptions in the Chriſtian Church at the æra of the great and laſt perſecution; on the contrary, he propoſed to confine his work to the delineating the heroical perſeverance of the Martyrs; and he began with declaring, in expreſs words, that he was *not* to write a hiſtory of the corruptions in the Chriſtian Church. To this declaration it is that he refers. (Mart. Palæſt. c. 12.) And Valeſius rightly obſerves, that although a like ſentiment occurs,

curs, (Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. viii. c. 2) the reference is to a preface of that work, now loſt.

" Had Euſebius given a detail of the corruptions of the Chriſtian Church, of the careleſs and irregular ordination of Biſhops, and of the ſcandalous diſſenſions among the brethren, the work would have been curious, but it would have been different from what he propoſed to write.

" An Author, undertaking to relate the calamities of the Proteſtants under Mary Queen of England, would not have incurred any blame, although he had omitted the miſerable diſputes concerning forms and ceremonies which too much occupied the attention of the perſecuted in thoſe times.

" Queſtions have occurred as to certain rights of Authors; but I ſuppoſe that the right of an Author *to chuſe his own ſubject* has never been queſtioned; and when an Author once chuſes his ſubject, he ought

to treat it in a regular, not a deſultory, manner.

" The work of Euſebius, if conſtructed on that plan which ſome of his readers propoſe, muſt have had a motley appearance. The ordination of illiterate or unworthy biſhops would have been interwoven with the narrative of the virtues and ſufferings of Apphianus and Pamphilus; the diſſenſions among the brethren, with the meek and benevolent prayer of the dying Paulus; and the fortitude of many Martyrs with the defections of thoſe men who eſteemed rather this life than " the re-" proach of Chriſt." *Then* would Euſebius have been triumphantly cenſured for want of judgment and perſpicuity, and for having given a tedious detail of frivolous controverſies and eccleſiaſtical altercations, inſtead of a pure and genuine Hiſtory of the Martyrs.

" But

" But Eusebius avoided this; he chose a subject and he persevered in it, without bewildering his self and his readers in digressions. If he ever deviates, it is but for a moment, and even then he does not lose sight of his subject.

" In the same twelfth Chapter, Eusebius, by a well-known figure in rhetoric, hints at those corruptions and enormities which *it fell not within the purpose of his work* particularly to describe. He says that he will not mention them, and then in few and *forcible* words he exhibits a *general* view of them to his readers." [4]

[4] Vol. 3. (Notes) p. 88—92. In p. 86—88 ibid, the learned Annotator remarks, with regard to the latter of the two passages of Eusebius which Mr. Gibbon has done so much injustice to, that " in the version of " Valesius the words of Eusebius are much more for- " cible than the words used by the Author his self," and considers the passage, (ἀλλα γαρ ὁσα στυγνα &c.) as I had myself before, as plainly to be interpreted by Philipp. iv. 8.

But

But one particular charge of exaggerated and unfaithful deſcription is brought againſt Euſebius, founded on the well-known paſſage of Origen. If the *few* Martyrs here ſpoken of are only ſtated as ſuch, when compared with the *whole* race of Chriſtians, [5] no argument can be derived from it to impeach the credit of Euſebius's teſtimony. But as Mr. Gibbon had before omitted the latter part of the ſentence in Origen, which ſeems to give ſuch a ſenſe to the whole, ſo he has now again been altogether ſilent as to the objection of his having been guilty of ſuch an omiſſion. It is further to be remarked alſo, that Mr. Gibbon, who had before expreſſly quoted the former part (only) of the aſſertion as "general," and had plainly conſidered it as relating to the Martyrs in the cauſe of Chriſtianity *everywhere* and at *different* periods, [6] now

[5] See the paſſage, Remarks, p. 205-8.
[6] See the context, Hiſtory, Vol. I. Ch. 546.

"ventures

"ventures to add," in a different ſpirit of interpretation, "that this paſſage more "immediately relates to the religious tem- "peſts which had been excited in the *time* "and *country* of *Origen*, and ſtill more "particularly to the city of Alexandria, "and to the perſecution of Severus." [7] I do not ſee on what arguments this *new* interpretation of the paſſage, for which no reaſons are given, is grounded; but it is obvious to remark that Mr. Gibbon can now no longer employ the paſſage, as before, as being ſufficient in itſelf in a manner to annihilate, *in general*, the reputed number of Martyrs before the time of Origen, and that he has thus far his ſelf confuted his own Sophiſm. The paſſage having been before applied by our Author as "general," and with no limitation either as to *time* or place, I thought it proper to

[7] Vindication, p. 125 and 126.

point

point out a diſtinction which, however indeed plain and obvious, yet ſeemed neceſſary to prevent miſtake altogether; and which another writer, partly of Mr. Gibbon's ſentiments on the ſubject in queſtion, yet more accurate and open, had indeed taken care to inſert. [8] While therefore on this occaſion Mr. Gibbon indulges his uſual vein of raillery at the "*ſagacity*" [9] of my remark, let him conſider whether it may not be poſſible that ſome may think him deſerving even of a ſerious rebuke for having made it neceſſary for me, by his own looſe and indefinite uſe of the paſſage, to point out to what times only it could in any caſe apply, if indeed at all applicable in the ſenſe contended for. But if it be not applicable in this ſenſe, if the *few* Martyrs of Origen (*few* as compared with "the *whole race* of Chriſtians, which God "for-

[8] Dodwell. See Note; Remarks, p. 206.
[9] Vindication, p. 125.

"bad

« bad ſhould be utterly overcome") are indeed reconcileable with the *many* Martyrs of Euſebius at Alexandria, his advocates will not be called on, even in caſe of admitting Mr. Gibbon's new interpretation of the paſſage of Origen, " to exert their cri- " tical ſkill" in proving that *many* and *few* " are ſynonimous and convertible terms." [1] But as Origen his ſelf has indeed in another place, in a paſſage well deſerving notice on the preſent occaſion, ſpoken of *many* Martyrs in his own times, [2] Mr. Gibbon perhaps may find his ſelf unexpectedly called on " to exert his critical " ſkill" in this hopeleſs buſineſs, to which he has too haſtily condemned others. What

[1] Vindication, p. 126.

[2] ΠΟΔΑΟΙ δε κ᾽ των καθ᾽ ημας επισαμενοι, ως ὁμολογησαντες μεν χριστιανισμον, ἀποθανουνται. αρνησαμενοι δε ἀπολυθησονται, κ᾽ τα υπαρχοντα απολημψονται, κατεφρονησαν μεν του βιου, εκουσιως δε τον υπερ Ευσεβειας θανατον ειλοντο.

Orig. contra Celſum. Lib. II. p. 71. edit. Spenceri.

elſe will become of the *few* Martyrs mentioned in the one paſſage, if they cannot indeed by ſome Herculean labour, impracticable certainly but by Heroes in Literature, be reconciled with "the many," which, unhappily for our Author's ſyſtem, are plainly ſpoken of in another? It is of further importance alſo, towards "removing the ſuſpicion which," according to our Author, "deeply fixes itſelf on the "hiſtorical character of the Biſhop of Cæ"ſarea," [3] (a ſuſpicion at the moſt derivable only from *one* ſingle inſtance of ſuppoſed contradiction to the teſtimony of another writer) to remark that a reaſon may be found in Euſebius, which makes it highly probable that there muſt have been many Martyrs at Alexandria. He tells us that Chriſtians were brought there to ſuffer from all parts of Egypt and

[3] Vindication, p. 126.

Thebais,

Thebais, during the perſecution of Severus. [4]

It will appear perhaps that nothing but a fixed diſpoſition to cenſure on all occaſions the unhappy devoted Euſebius, nothing but a rooted prejudice imperceptibly imbibed could have ſo far impoſed either on the judgment or the diligence of our Author, as to induce him to exhibit in his Vindication a freſh Charge, which will not indeed ſtand the teſt of Examination. A Chapter in the Evangelical Preparation of Euſebius, in which, we are told, "he alleges a paſſage of Plato, which approves "the occaſional practice of pious and ſalutary frauds," bears for it's title this ſcandalous propoſition, "How it may be "lawful and fitting to uſe falſehood as a "medicine, and for the benefit of thoſe

[4] μαλιστα δ' επληθυεν επ' αλεξανδρειας των απ' Αιγυπτυ και Θηβαιδος αθλητων αριστινδην αυτοθι ωσπερ επι μεγιστου Θεου παραπεμπομενων γαδιον.

Euſ. H. E. Lib. VI. Cap. I.

"who want to be deceived; nor is Euſe-
bius" it is added, "aſhamed to juſtify the
"ſentiments of the Athenian Philoſopher
"by the example of the ſacred writers of
"the Old Teſtament. [5]

It is indeed without reaſon that this propoſition has ſounded ſo very "offen-
"ſively in the ears" of Mr. Gibbon, on this occaſion at leaſt as "tender" as he has been pleaſed to repreſent mine on another occaſion. [6] And I am again obliged to "exclaim moſt lamentably," (in Mr. Gibbon's fanciful and exaggerated ſtile of deſcription) that we ſhould "hear Euſebius before we utterly condemn him." [7] We ſhall hence be enabled more eſpecially to do away at once the imputation laid to the

[5] Vindication, p. 130.

[6] "The other appellation of a paſſionate declaimer which ſeems to have ſounded ſtill more offenſive in *the tender ears* of Dr. Chelſum, was not, &c.—Vindication, p. 135.

[7] Vindication, p. 127; and p. 51 of this Reply.

charge

charge of "the ſacred writers of the Old Teſtament," as well as to place the queſtion altogether in it's proper light. The ſentiments of the Athenian Philoſopher, it ſhould be remarked in juſtice to him, appear from the context in his own treatiſe to relate only to the buſineſs of inſtructing youth by the method of *Fable*. [8] And they are no otherwiſe juſtified by Euſebius, than by inſtancing the neceſſity of ſometimes ſpeaking not ſtrictly according to Truth, in thoſe many paſſages in the writings of the Hebrews, in which God, in accommodation to our limited faculties, is repreſented as ſleeping, or enraged, or affected by other human paſſions. [9] The

[8] See his Treatiſe περι νομοθεσιας. Lib. II. p. 66. edit. Serrani. H. Steph. 1578.

[9] μυρια δ'αν ευρησεις τοιαυτα (ſuch ſeemingly, i. e. as the fictions which Plato recommends) καὶ εν Εβραιων γραφαις, ως αν περι Θεου ζηλουντος, η υπνουντος, η οργιζομενου, η τισιν αλλοις ανθρωποπαθεσιν ενεχομενου, επ' ωφελεια των δεομενων του τοιουδε τροπου παρειλλημενα.

Euſeb. Præp. Evang. L. XII. C. 31. edit. Paris, 1628.

fictions

fictions here alluded to, while the end and neceſſity of them, "for the benefit of thoſe "who ſtand in need of ſuch a mode of "addreſs" [1] are fully underſtood, are not conſidered as reflecting any diſhonour on the ſacred writings. And if we may be allowed only to fix the ſenſe in which Euſebius approves of Plato's poſition, by the inſtances he has given, he muſt his ſelf be acquitted alſo of the heavy charge which is brought againſt him. But if it be duly remarked further, that the words ψευδος and ψευδεσθαι are plainly uſed frequently in the writings of the ancients in a very extended and general ſenſe, and denote deviations from truth generally eſteemed innocent, ſuch as Fables, Parables, Allegories, &c. as well as *ſcandalous* Falſehoods, the real meaning both of Plato and Euſebius will admit ſeemingly of a full defence, and much alſo, it may be, of the Calumny

[1] των δεομενων του τοιουτου τροπου.

which

which has been very liberally vented againſt the Fathers on account of their ſuppoſed approbation of pious Frauds will at the ſame time be done away. In fact, a doctrine plainly ſimilar to that which in the preſent caſe appears to be maintained by Euſebius, (inaſmuch as the very ſame expreſſions may be obſerved to occur) but more fully and clearly guarded by expreſſly mentioning the caſes of the ſick, of perſons in danger from an enemy, &c. has been repeatedly advanced by ſeveral of the Fathers, [2] who yet at other times make the

[2] Αληθη τε φρονει αμα, κ᾽ αληθευει (γνωστικος) πλην οι μη ποτε ΕΝ ΘΕΡΑΠΕΙΑΣ ΜΕΡΕΙ, καθαπερ ιατρος νοσουντας επι σωτηρια των καμνοντων, ψευσεται η ψευδος ερει κατα της Σοφιας.

Clem. Alex. Strom. Lib. VII. p. 863. edit. Potter.

Ου μονον δε τους τα σωματα θεραπευοντας, αλλα κ᾽ τους των ψυχικων νοσηματων επιμελομενους ευροι τις αν συνεχως τουτω κεχρημενους τω φαρμακω (ſc. απατη). Μαλλον δε ουδε ᾽απατην το τοιουτο δει καλειν, αλλ᾽ οικονομιαν τινα, κ᾽ σοφιαν κ᾽ τεχνην ικανην πολλως πορυς εν τοις αποροις ευρων κ᾽ πλημμελειας επανορθωσαι ψυχης.

Chryſoſt. De Sacerdot. Lib. I. p. 369, 370. ed. Ben.

ſtrongeſt

ſtrongeſt declarations againſt real Lies; and the ſame doctrine has again been openly defended in modern times by the reſpectable authorities of Grotius and Puffendorf. I am however ready to confeſs myſelf, that I hold our general and natural obligation to the obſervance of Truth to be ſo ſacred and important, that I at leaſt doubt whether even for the moſt ſalutary purpoſes, ſome of thoſe deceits which theſe great caſuiſts themſelves approve of ought to be practiſed; whether they may not tend, imperceptibly, to leſſen our regard for Truth on other occaſions. It ſeems however plain on the whole, that Euſebius has advanced no other doctrine than what the greateſt and beſt men, no leſs averſe than others from open and ſcandalous Lies, have expreſſly maintained, and that thus far at leaſt therefore he ſtands juſtified; and it muſt ſurely be acknowledged on a review of the general doctrine in queſtion, that the

matter

matter ſhould have been more maturely weighed by our Author, before he had proceeded to accuſe Euſebius in ſuch ſtrong and unqualified terms.

It is admitted that the charge againſt Euſebius of his having been guilty of a criminal compliance in the time of perſecution, is not "legally proved," but it is now additionally contended that "it is ſupported by a reaſonable ſhare of preſumptive evidence." [3] The amount of this preſumptive evidence may deſerve yet further to be enquired into; as well as the queſtion concerning the part which Euſebius took in oppoſition to Athanaſius. It will then appear perhaps that ſome of our Author's preſumptive arguments have been too haſtily advanced.

The two charges of murder and ſacrilege exhibited in the Council of Tyre againſt

[3] Vindication, p. 139.

Athanaſius appear clearly from the abundant evidence exhibited in his Apology to Conſtantine, to have been as falſe as they were malicious. But reſpecting "the iniquitous perſecution" which followed this accuſation, I cannot ſee on what ſufficient grounds Euſebius of Cæſarea can be ſaid to have "*conducted*" it. It appears from Epiphanius that Conſtantine appointed him a judge on the occaſion, along with others; [4] but the paſſages appealed to by Mr. Gibbon (Athanaſ. tom. 1. p. 728, 795, 797) to prove that "he conducted this "iniquitous proſecution from a motive of "perſonal enmity" by no means ſupport the aſſertion, ſince they appear plainly to relate to another Euſebius, Euſebius of Nicomedia. For, reſpecting the firſt of theſe paſſages, Euſebius of Nicomedia has immediately before been expreſſly pointed

[4] εκελευσε δε δικαζειν Ευσεβιον, κ) αλλους τινας.
Adv. Hæres. L. II. Sect. vii.

out

out, and in the other two we muſt again ſuppoſe the ſame Euſebius to be intended, becauſe he is joined with Theognis and Maris, with whom we have expreſs proof that Euſebius of *Nicomedia* confederated. [5] And it may be further ſhewn from Epiphanius, [6] (who, as his teſtimony is confirmed by that of others, need not perhaps be ſuſpected in this inſtance of too great credulity) nay, ſeemingly, even from Athanaſius his ſelf, [7] that the eager and

[5] Ουτω γαρ ηλπιζον μονως την Αρειανην δοξαν κρατησειν, Αθανασιου εκποδων γενομενου· συμπαρατιονται ουν κατ' αυτου Ευσεβιος ὁ ΝΙΚΟΜΕΔΕΙΑΣ, Θεογνις Νικαιας, Μαρις Χαλκηδονος, &c.

Socr. H. E. Lib. I. C. XXVII. Ed. Cantab.

See alſo, in the ſame chapter, an account of Iſchyras the calumniator's flying to Euſebius of *Nicomedia*.

[6] Ευσεβιος δε ην Ὁ ΠΡΟΕΙΡΗΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΝΙΚΟΜΕΔΕΙΑΣ ὁ υπουργος του παντος αυτων συςηματος, καὶ συσκευαςης της κατα την εκκλησιαν τε καὶ τον Παπαν Αθανασιον Ελαβης.

Epiphan. adv. Hær. L. II. Sect. VI. Hær. LXVIII.

[7] The Epiſtle of the Biſhops of Egypt expreſsly ſpeaks of Euſebius of *Nicomedia* as having objected to Athanaſius's conſecration. Athanaſ. t. 1, p. 726.

active enemy of Athanaſius was not Euſebius of Cæſarea, but Euſebius of *Nicomedia*, a known favourer of the Arian party.

The ſhort and authentic memorial on which our Author inſiſts as a proof of the guilt of Euſebius of Cæſarea in another reſpect, he very liberally ſuppoſes to have "eſcaped the knowledge or the *candor* of "the confederate Doctors." [8] Here let Mr. Gibbon be informed, in anſwer to his very indulgent ſuppoſition, that this paſſage, tho' not unknown, might yet well appear not to merit notice, when conſidered only as containing a general charge, without any abſolute proof of the truth of it. Nothing more can be collected from it, on the teſtimony of the Biſhops of Egypt their ſelves, than that ſome of the Confeſſors had "*accuſed* Euſebius of an "act relative to idolatrous ſacrifice," as the Phraſe περι θυσιων ſeems to import. How

[8] Vindication, p. 140.

far

far the accuſation was believed, within what diſtance of time it had been exhibited, much leſs in what degree it had been made good, in no ſort appears. It is eaſy to conceive that the violence of the Athanaſian and Arian parties might lead to many *groundleſs* accuſations on each ſide.

Reſpecting the other ſuppoſed preſumptive proof of Euſebius's guilt, the appeal of Potamon to him as conſcious that they were in priſon together, may ſeem certainly to carry with it conſiderable weight. Our Author his ſelf however candidly acknowledges that "he was moſt aſſuredly actu-"ated by a ſtrong prejudice againſt Euſe-"bius;" and if the opinion of a variety of modern able writers may be taken, much ſtreſs muſt not be laid on the teſtimony of Epiphanius alone, from whom the narrative is extracted. Even Cardinal Baronius his ſelf, that zealous friend of Orthodoxy, who might therefore have been

been partial to the Author of a capital work againſt Hereſies, conſiders Epiphanius as having been unfortunately very credulous, and as abounding in miſtakes. [9] The opinions of Caſaubon and Dupin go to the ſame point, [1] and the judicious Moſheim has not heſitated to uſe the ſame ſtile concerning the work of Epiphanius, ſaying that "it is full of inaccuracies and "errors, and diſcovers almoſt in every "page the ignorance of it's Author." [2] We may add on the ſame ſide the opinion

[9] Ad ann. 372.

[1] Vir maximus Epiphanius, ſed quem res arguit ipſa levibus auditiunculis, neſcio unde acceptis, facile nimis aliquando fidem habuiſſe.

Caſaubon Exercitat. xv. num. xxxiii.

Paſſim hallucinatur (Epiphanius) in hiſtoriæ factis notatu digniſſimis, et falſis monumentis rumoribuſq; incertis nimis temere fidem adhibet.

Dupin nov. bibl. Script. Eccleſ. t. 2. p. 762.

[2] B. II. Ch. II. p. 292. Dr. Maclaine's Tranſl. of his Eccl. Hiſt.

of

of Beauſobre [3] and of Dr. Jortin, who calls Epiphanius "the Father of Tales, "and a diligent collector of groundleſs "and cenſorious reports." [4] It is remarkable that he inſtances in the caſe of a ſimilar accuſation. This common and received character of Epiphanius as an Hiſtorian, ought not perhaps to have been omitted in quoting his narrative. Mr. Gibbon his ſelf has called him "the "*credulous* Epiphanius" on another occaſion, (Hiſt. Vol. 2, p. 280, Note 23) when he rejects his teſtimony.

The collateral teſtimony of Photius however, on which Mr. Gibbon further inſiſts, will appear perhaps of ſtill leſs weight than the doubtful tale of Epiphanius, when we conſider that Photius flouriſhed ſo long after the ſuppoſed tranſaction as the ninth

[3] Un Auteur auſſi credule, et auſſi violent, que l'a eté S. Epiphane. (H. de Manich. t. 1. p. 43.)

[4] Remarks on Eccleſiaſtical Hiſt. Vol. II. p. 230.

cen-

century. It may be altogether eaſily imagined that from the particular intimacy which ſubſiſted between Euſebius and Pamphilus, and from his being on the ſame ſpot, Euſebius would, if permitted, pay frequent and long viſits to Pamphilus; and he might at ſuch times take part with him, as recorded, in ſome common work. In the courſe of five centuries the miſtaken, yet not far different report, that he was actually confined in priſon with Pamphilus, might perhaps have ariſen on no other foundation. Lardner heſitates between the two ſuppoſitions, and ſays that Euſebius "either made Pamphilus many viſits, *or* "was ſhut up with him in priſon." [3]

But were we to admit even that Euſebius was in priſon, the imputations deduced from thence can at the moſt be founded only on conjecture, which ſeems to lead alſo to probable arguments on the other ſide. He might perhaps have been

[5] Credibility, Vol. VIII. p. 38.

one

one of thoſe happy few who met with a free and indulgent pardon. If he had to boaſt of an "honourable diſcharge," it yet ſurely ought not to be objected to him that he has on this head "obſerved a "profound ſilence." [4] And if he was conſcious of not having been guilty of any criminal compliance, he might not have any reaſon to foreſee that ſuſpicions would ariſe in after times from his not ſpeaking to that point. Had his three books on the life of Pamphilus happily come down to us, (H. E. L. 7, C. 32) the matter, ſo far at leaſt as concerns his ſuppoſed impriſonment with this martyr, might probably have been aſcertained. Or had we the life of Euſebius his ſelf, written by his ſucceſſor Acacius, (Socrat. L. 2, C. 4) we ſhould poſſeſs probably a defence of him by a friend and contemporary, in anſwer to

[4] Vindication, p. 142.

the ſuggeſtions thrown out againſt him, as related by Epiphanius, if indeed ſuch ſuggeſtions were thrown out. In ſtill ſuppoſing Euſebius very probably innocent, even though we have not his own or his friend's teſtimony to appeal to, I am in particular countenanced by the accurate Lardner, as well as by Valeſius, Dupin, Cave, &c. "But this" (the accuſation of having been guilty of a diſhonourable compliance) ſays he, "is a general accuſation "without ground, No one was ever able "to ſpecify any mean act of compliance "in particular, as appears from Potamon's "charge in Epiphanius. He may have "been for ſome time in priſon in Egypt, "and releaſed without any thing diſho- "nourable in the affair. [5]

In what I have juſt advanced, ſince I wrote my own obſervations, I again have

[5] Credibility, Vol. VIII. p. 38.

the

the ſatisfaction of finding myſelf in perfect agreement with the learned author whom I have already quoted. He obſerves, that from the Epiſtle of the Egyptian Biſhops, (Athanaſ. t. 1, p. 126) we may with *certainty* conclude that *the Euſebius* who preſided at the Council of Tyre was a different perſon from Euſebius Pamphilus, Biſhop of Cæſarea. "The Egyptian Biſhops," he adds, "make that diſtinction "between the two which many modern "authors have overlooked; and if Euſe"bius of Cæſarea did not preſide, we may "be aſſured Euſebius, Biſhop of Nico"media, did." [6]

He vindicates Euſebius alſo from the charge brought againſt him by Potamo, both on conſiderations drawn from the narrative itſelf, and on the plea of the proba-

[6] Remains of Chriſtian Antiquity, Vol. III. containing Euſebius's Hiſtory of the Martyrs in Paleſtine, p. 103. (Notes).

bility of his having been delivered honourably, ſhould we even admit the ſuppoſition of his having been in priſon.

" It muſt be admitted, that the zeal of Potamo led him to uſe very intemperate language, and hardly conſiſtent with the apoſtolical precepts. That the reproach of diſhonourable compliance was urged againſt Euſebius in his own preſence, is true: but then we ought to remember by *whom* it was urged; by a man in a paſſion, who aſſerted nothing from his own knowledge, and who ſatisfied his ſelf with making a declamatory charge; and this charge, it will be remarked, went on the illogical and erroneous ſuppoſition, that no Chriſtian, if once impriſoned, could have eſcaped puniſhment, unleſs by a criminal compliance with the rites of Paganiſm.

" The zeal and ſufferings of Potamo might have entitled him to that reſpect which conſiſts in making no anſwer to words that

that ought not to have been uſed; and hard would be the lot of calm and prudent perſons, if their ſilence on ſuch occaſions were to be interpreted as a confeſſion of the truth of the words ſpoken. What Potamo ſaid was contrary to the order obſerved in all well-regulated aſſemblies; and had Euſebius made any anſwer, it would only have ſerved to increaſe the diſorder; and, probably, it was on that account that the Preſident" (who, it ſhould now be remembered, was not Euſebius of Cæſarea his ſelf) "adjourned the Council."

Valeſius (de vitâ et ſcriptis Euſebii Cæſarienſis, fol. 2, 6) draws the ſame concluſion. "Cardinalis Baronius illud quaſi certum ratumq; arripuit, quod Euſebio per jurgium et altercationem objectum eſt ab ejus adverſariis, nec ullius teſtimonio confirmatum." [7]

[7] Ibid, p. 107—109. (Notes).

Re-

Reſpecting the probability of Euſebius's having obtained an honourable deliverance, ſhould we ſuppoſe him to have been in priſon, I am tempted alſo to tranſcribe the following remarks.

"Euſebius, as a man of letters, might have found friends to intereſt their ſelves for him, and even to purchaſe his ſafety. We know, that on a particular occaſion all the Chriſtians, ſave one, were releaſed; and it is not improbable that the ſame ſort of indulgence might have been repeated.

"Beſides, we learn accidentally, that, during the perſecution, Euſebius removed from one country to another; that he was in Phœnicia, (b. 8. c. 7.) and in Egypt (b. 8. c. 9.) This judicious and evangelical conduct enabled him to elude the fury of the perſecutors, which muſt have been chiefly directed againſt the inhabitants of the different territories where the edicts were promulgated."

To

To this remark, which may ſeem to make it probable indeed that Euſebius was not at all impriſoned, it is again added, on the ſuppoſition of his having been in priſon, that if he "could not have eſcaped unleſs by ſome ſinful compliance, neither could any other impriſoned Chriſtian of Paleſtine, who, without loſs of eyes, or maiming of limbs, ſurvived the perſecution. But this inference is extravagant, and cannot be true." [8]

I muſt indeed ſtill think alſo that the preſumptive argument drawn from the promotion of Euſebius is of much force towards ſhewing the improbability of his having been diſcharged in conſequence of a criminal compliance. It has been advanced, not only by Valeſius, as Mr. Gibbon remarks, but by Dupin alſo, and by Cave and Lardner, the latter of whom argues

[8] Ibid, p. 100. (Notes).

ex-

expreſſly, that " if Euſebius had ſacrificed, " or done any thing like it, he would not " have been made Biſhop of Cæſarea, nor " invited to the See of Antioch." The inſtance which our Author alleges from Philoſtorgius, as quoted by Bingham, to prove " the impurity of *many* Epiſco- " pal Apoſtates," will be found, when duly examined, far from affording any proof of this kind, to exhibit a ſtrong inſtance of the rigid diſcipline of the Church towards Apoſtates. Bingham indeed has by chance miſtaken the true interpretation of the paſſage. It by no means appears from thence, that " if Philoſtorgius ſays " true *all* the leading Biſhops of the Arian " party (amounting to ten) ſacrificed in " the Diocletian perſecution." [9] It appears only that the two laſt (for theſe two are plainly mentioned additionally by their

[9] Antiq. B. IV. Chap. III. S. 7. p. 126. 8vo. ed.

ſelves)

ſelves) had, as it was reported, become Idolaters, but had afterwards been brought to repentance by their maſter Lucian. [1] The deſign of the whole paragraph is certainly to enumerate the diſciples of Lucian, not to enumerate thoſe among them who had lapſed. And to make the appeal to this paſſage ſtill the more unfortunate, we may learn from the Hiſtory of Socrates, that of theſe *two* who thus lapſed, one, Aſterius, far from having been a Biſhop,

[1] Οτι τουτου του μαρτυρος (Λουκιανου) πολλους μεν κ᾽ αλλους μαθητας αναγραφει, οις κ᾽ Ευσεβιον της Νικομηδειας, κ᾽ Μαριν τον Καλχηδονος, και τον Νικαιας Θεογνιν συντατ῀η, &c. ΟΥ̓ ΜΗΝ ΑΛΛΑ κ᾽ Αλεξανδρον κ᾽ Αστεριον της Καππαδοκιας ΟΥΣ κ᾽ ελληνισαι φησι ενδοντας τη των τυραννων δια, υστερον δι ανακαλεισασθαι την ητ῀αν, συλλαβομενου αυτους προς την μετανοιαν του διδασκαλου.

Philoſtorg. L. 2. C. 15. p. 21. edit. Gothofred.

The interpretation of this paſſage given above, is confirmed by the opinion of the Editor and Annotator his ſelf.

De Lucianiſtis his *duo* ait Philoſtorgius.

Diſſert. in Lib. 2. C. 15 and 16. p. 84.

could not even obtain *the Prieſthood, becauſe he had ſacrificed in the time of perſecution.* [2] A remarkable proof this, not of "the impurity of an Apoſtate," but, on the contrary, of the rigid diſcipline of the Church towards Apoſtates, and of the agreement of "theory and practice" which prevailed in the fourth century.

"The indulgence ſhewn to the *lapſed*, "the degraded, the ſchiſmatic Biſhop of "Lycopolis," [3] bears nevertheleſs at the ſame time, when the whole Hiſtory is conſidered, plain teſtimony to the diſcipline that was in force. The indulgence itſelf is expreſſly ſpoken of as being *particular*,

[2] Αρειος τις εν Καππαδωκια σφοδρωτην μετιων, την μεν κατελειπε· χριστιανιζειν δε επηγγελλετο· —— Και δη και εις τας συνοδους απαντα, υποδυναι μιας πολεως επισκοπην προθυμουμενος. ΑΛΛ' ΙΕΡΩΣΥΝΗΣ ΜΕΝ ΗΣΤΟΧΗΣΕ, ΔΙΑ ΤΟ ΕΠΙΤΕΘΥΚΕΝΑΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΝ ΔΙΩΓΜΟΝ.

Socr. H. E. Lib. I. C. XXXVI.

[3] Vindication, p. 144.

and

and wholly unmerited. [4] But Melitius had been degraded principally becauſe he had lapſed. [5] And the Synod decreed, altho' it allowed him to retain "the mere "name of honour," that he ſhould be confined to his own city, and have no authority to exerciſe his Eccleſiaſtical Functions. [6] Whatever might be the true reaſons which induced the Synod to diſpenſe with a part of the puniſhment ſeemingly due to him, in not actually depoſing him, and taking away from him the title,

[4] εδοξεν ουν Μελιτιον. μεν, ΦΙΛΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΤΕΡΟΝ ΚΙΝΗΘΕΙΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΣΥΝΟΔΟΥ· κατα γαρ τον ακριβη λογον ηδεμιας συγγνωμης αξιος ην.

Socr. H. E. Lib. 1, C. 9.

[5] Μαλιστα ὁτι εν τω διωγμω αρνησαμενος την πιστιν, επεθυσεν.

Ibid, L. 1. C. 6.

[6] Μενειν εν τη πολει ἑαυτου, κ᾽ μηδεμιαν ἐξουσιαν εχειν ἀυτον μητε χειροθετειν, μητε προχειριζεσθαι, μητε εν χωρα, μητε ἐν πολει ἑτερα φαινεσθαι, ταυτης της προφασεως ἑνεκα· ψιλον δε το ονομα της τιμης κεκτησθαι.

Ibid, L. 1. C. 9.

as well as the power of a Biſhop, yet the indulgence ſhewn to one who had been a Biſhop *before* he lapſed, will not ſurely much ſtrengthen the probability of Euſebius's having been made a Biſhop ſoon *after* his ſuppoſed lapſe. If impriſoned with Pamphilus, who is reputed to have ſuffered in the year 309, Euſebius was made Biſhop in four years after.

I have now attended diligently and in order to the ſeveral articles of Mr. Gibbon's Vindication as directed more eſpecially againſt myſelf. It remains for me yet to attend to ſome few points treated of in that part which relates to Mr. Davis.

Reſpecting the firſt of theſe I am to remark, that our Author has in effect renounced his objection againſt the canonical authority of the Apocalypſe as drawn from the proceedings of the Council of Laodicea, by condeſcending to adopt the anſwer which I made to him, and to acknowledge, indi-

indirectly, the truth of my remark, by ſtating "the fact," as it is ſtiled, in a ſimple, but "more particular manner." [7] But why not uſe at firſt the ſame "particular manner?" why not acknowledge originally that the Apocalypſe was only omitted in the liſt of books to be *read in Churches*, (for which particular reaſons may be eaſily alleged) inſtead of aſſerting far differently, that it "was tacitly excluded from *the ſacred Canon?*"

His ſtate of the ſtory of Nemeſius, "as "having been *accuſed* of robbery," our Author indeed has attempted to juſtify, in anſwer to my remarks, on the ground of that very proceeding on the part of the Governor, which the Hiſtorian referred to complains of as unjuſt." "The ſupreme "Magiſtrate," it is argued, "conſidered "Nemeſius as guilty, and affected to ſhew "by the meaſure of his tortures, and by

[7] Vindication, p. 37.

"the

" the companions of his execution, that " he punished him not only as a Christian, " but as a robber." [8] And this circumstance alone therefore is insisted on, as deserving to be set in counterbalance to the positive testimony of Dionysius in Eusebius. Yet, after all, the *opinion* of the Governor is left inferred by implication from the *fact* of his determination: An uncertain mode of reasoning seemingly, when the usual prejudices of the Heathen Governors in such cases are taken into the account, and when the rigour of the persecution in question is remembered. And I cannot indeed consider the weight of evidence as being so exactly equal, as to justify our Author in having wholly omitted on one side the mention of his having been *falsly* accused of having been the companion of robbers, and of his having been regularly *acquitted* after due judicial

[8] Vindication, p. 43.

en-

enquiry, ſuch as we may ſuppoſe to have been made. I have thought it right, as being concerned myſelf, to ſpeak thus far to theſe two points, altho' Mr. Davis has in reality already ſufficiently diſcuſſed them. [9]

But may we not, in the latter caſe, object alſo to the legality of the very principle of deciſion which our Author has aſſumed? Is it the juſt privilege of the Hiſtorian, "in doubtful ſituations" as to the relation of particular facts, to form a ſummary opinion of his own, and omit at pleaſure particular circumſtances of the entire narrative? or is it his evident duty rather to ſtate the whole, and to leave the deciſion to his reader? I cannot but preſume to think that in the former caſe the writer evidently aſſumes a right which does not belong to him, while he obtrudes his own *opinion*, inſtead of recording cir-

[9] Davis's Reply, p. 50, &c. and p. 68, &c.

cum-

cumſtances of moment placed before him. I cannot but think indeed that this indefenſible principle very unhappily pervades a great part of our Author's Hiſtory, and is one cauſe of the miſtakes which it contains. I cannot but grieve alſo that our Author ſhould have ſpoken with ſuch indifference of "the queſtion of the guilt "or innocence" of Nemeſius as "fortu-"nately of little moment." [1] This indifference ſurely is neither agreeable to the proper duties of an Hiſtorian, who ought to do juſtice to the character of thoſe of whom he ſpeaks; nor to the natural feelings of a Man, who ought to rejoice rather to find his fellow-creature innocent than guilty.

Mr. Gibbon remains alſo to be informed, that he has made very unjuſtifiable uſe of the term "Sycophant, (in the Greek ſenſe of the word)" as applied to the remark

[1] Vindication, p. 43.

of

of my late reſpectable Collegue. The accuſation delivered in this remark, as adopted by me, is delivered in no ſtronger terms than thoſe of my expreſſing "my "ſurprize at ſuch a remarkable omiſſion" [2] as that of the mention of Nemeſius's having been *falſly* accuſed, and of his having *cleared* his ſelf from the charge. As it is moſt certain that Mr. Gibbon did omit theſe circumſtances, he cannot therefore thus far have been falſly accuſed, and he his ſelf alone, in conſequence, becomes the Sycophant. To attempt to defend the omiſſion, and to explain the cauſe of of it, is one thing; to deny having made the omiſſion, and to aſſert therefore that the charge exhibited by Dr. Randolph and myſelf is falſe, is a diſtinct matter, and is to oppoſe demonſtration itſelf. Reſpecting another error, in ſpeaking of the *ex-*

[2] Remarks, p. 209.

tenſive dioceſe of New Cæſarea, it will be ſufficient to refer to Mr. Davis, whoſe objections he has conſidered with my own.[3]

Few as the ſeveral inſtances are altogether in which Mr. Gibbon has attempted to vindicate the objectionable paſſages of his Hiſtory, yet even in theſe few inſtances he may be often found indulging his ſelf rather in perſonal retort, and licentious wit, than employing real arguments. How far the little reaſoning which he has uſed may in any inſtances be deemed ſucceſsful, remains with others to determine.

But it is now to be further added, that a great part of thoſe remarks, which a careful examination of Mr. Gibbon's aſſertions could not but lead to, ſtill remains utterly unnoticed; and that the different errors pointed out, however indefenſible ſuch conduct muſt ſeem, are ſtill proudly

[3] Reply, p. 59.

re-

retained, without alteration or defence, in the ſucceſſive editions of his Hiſtory. Yet if miſtakes relating ſometimes to the characters and conduct of individuals, ſometimes to the hiſtory and good repute of the Chriſtian Church in general, ſometimes to the evidences and authority of the Scriptures, are to be deemed of any real importance, it cannot be urged that the notice of ſuch errors has been omitted becauſe they related to matters in their ſelves trifling and indifferent. Their true nature may be ſeen in that recapitulation of them, which it is now become my duty briefly to enter into, for the purpoſe of ſtill preſerving the truth of hiſtory, again violated by the continued repetition of many different miſtakes. Mr. Gibbon's confident remark, that "were "he to correct," according to mine and my late reſpectable Collegue's wiſhes, "all the particular facts againſt which we

" have advanced any objections, theſe cor-
" rections, admitted in their fulleſt extent,
" would hardly furniſh materials for a de-
" cent liſt of *errata*," [4] will be found ſurely to have been made far too haſtily, when only that part of this *decent* liſt of *errata* which remains ſtill unnoticed, and ſtill retained, ſhall have been fairly conſidered.

I am indeed in every reſpect entitled to enter into this examination, ſince I have ſpoken fully of each of the three miſtakes objected to myſelf; for the firſt of which I do not hold myſelf accountable; [5] the ſecond of which aroſe merely from accidental inadvertence, ſuch as may be found often even in the greateſt writers; [6] and the laſt of which was a caſual overſight, for which I have expreſſed a real concern. [7] The wilful miſrepreſentations of which I

[4] Vindication, p. 102.
[5] P. 27 of this Reply.
[6] Ibid, p. 28.
[7] Ibid, p. 30.

am

am now to treat differ from ſuch miſtakes as much in kind as they do in number.

Some of theſe, which our Author has avowedly retained, without really attempting to defend them, have been already ſpoken of. Taking the reſt as they occur in order, I may firſt complain of our Author's having ſtill retained his erroneous aſſertions concerning the "implacable ha-"tred of the Jews to the reſt of human "kind," and of his very inſufficient and fallacious quotation in ſupport of ſuch aſſertions. It was ſhewn by direct appeal to many different paſſages of the Moſaic Law (to which many other ſimilar paſſages might even yet be added) that, on the contrary, it's precepts enjoin the general practice of humanity towards ſtrangers—that Joſephus ſpecifies thoſe very acts of friendſhip as due towards *all* ſtrangers which Juvenal aſſerts the Moſaic Law to have forbidden; and that the very quotations

tion from Maimonides, a Rabbi who lived as late as in the *twelfth* century, appears only to have been *repeated* from the gloſs of ſome Commentator on the Talmud; whereas the authentic Jewiſh Law to be found in the writings of Moſes ſhould certainly alone have been conſulted. [8] Yet this injurious character of the Jewiſh nation is ſtill to be found in the text of our Author's Hiſtory; yet the paſſage of the Roman Satiriſt, (ſtrong as the prejudices of the Romans againſt the Jews, and frequent as their miſinformation with regard to them, are well known to have been) is ſtill appealed to; yet the tradition repeated by Maimonides is ſtill conſidered as proper Evidence. [9]

[8] Remarks, p. 20—25.

[9] Vol. II. 8vo edit. p. 268, which, as the laſt edition, has been always conſulted in the ſeveral inſtances following.

With

With the ſame pertinacity alſo the remarkable *openeſs* of Juſtin Martyr's declaration diſplayed in his own words [1] ſtill remains delineated by our Author under the idea of "the moſt guarded diffidence;" [2] Juſtin is ſtill made to confeſs that "there were *very many* among the *orthodox* Chriſtians" [3] of the uncharitable opinion ſpoken of, altho' his own words import only that there were *ſome* of ſuch an opinion, without any particular reference, [4] and Trypho is ſtill repreſented as "*preſſing* him to declare the ſentiment of *the Church*, [5] without any real foundation for the aſſertion in the original paſſage.

[1] Remarks, p. 29.
[2] Vol. II. p. 280.
[3] Vol. II. p. 281.
[4] Remarks, p. 29.
[5] Vol. II. p. 281.

In

In reſpect of another paſſage, not to ſtate again the ſeveral arguments urged to ſhew it to be probable that Ignatius has quoted in his Epiſtle to the Smyrnæans the certain teſtimony of the Evangeliſts, "inſtead of employing a vague and doubt-"ful tradition," borrowed from the ſpurious Goſpel of the Nazarenes, [6] it is at leaſt proper to remark, that our Author had been reminded that Ignatius has elſewhere at leaſt abundantly recommended and appealed to the teſtimony of the Evangeliſts. And it can ſcarcely therefore be deemed fair to have retained the ſame oblique inſinuation againſt their teſtimony, [7] founded at the moſt on uncertain arguments, and contradicted by other expreſs appeals to the Evangeliſts occurring in Ignatius's writings. As I quoted however Biſhop Pearſon as of opinion that Ignatius has in reality meant

[6] Remarks, p. 42—49.
[7] Vol. II. p. 286. Note 35.

to

to allude to the paſſage of St. Luke where words exactly of the ſame import are to be found, whom our Author has ſince cited as favouring his own opinion, [8] I ought further to appeal alſo to Mr. Davis's Reply. It appears that Mr. Gibbon has ſtopped ſomewhat too ſhort in his appeal to the learned Biſhop, as the Biſhop afterwards explains his meaning, and delivers the opinion which I alluded to. [9]

It may be deemed ſurely an omiſſion alſo which deſerved attention, to have appealed to St. Paul's firſt Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians as countenancing the opinion of the near approach of the end of the world, but to have left unnoticed St. Paul's expreſs declaration againſt this erroneous opinion in his ſubſequent Epiſtle. After our Author's having been expreſſly reminded of this, [1] after Dr. Watſon's having adduced alſo

[8] Vindication, p. 63.
[9] Davis's Reply, p. 33.
[1] Remarks, p. 53.

many pertinent arguments to ſhew that the near approach of the end of the world was not at all predicted by the Apoſtles, [2] (a circumſtance which affects materially our Author's reaſoning) yet we find both his Text and Note ſtill remaining in full force, without either alteration or defence.

To the arguments alſo which were adduced to ſhew that the hiſtory of the tranſaction between Theophilus and Autolycus was in reality very erroneouſly ſtated both by Dr. Middleton and our Author, [3] no reply whatſoever has been made; but the more convenient method of paſſing over the whole in ſilence has been adopted. Yet the text itſelf, undefended as it is, is ſtill retained as before, and may ſtill ſerve to deceive the incautious reader. The ſame is the

[2] Letter II. See alſo this point very fully and ably diſcuſſed, in anſwer to Mr. Gibbon, by the Rev. Mr. Taylor on the Grand Apoſtacy, &c. Lond. 1781.

[3] Remarks, p. 81—92.

caſe

caſe alſo with reſpect to the miſrepreſentation of a remarkable paſſage in Irenæus. [4]

The very partial and erroneous account extracted from Prudentius is ſtill introduced alſo with no leſs confidence than if the miſrepreſentation had not at all been detected. I have before remarked that it has not been in any ſort defended. [5] It cannot ſurely be deemed conſiſtent with the character of a faithful hiſtorian, it cannot ſurely by any means be reconciled with the idea of "accuracy," which our Author has pronounced to be an "indiſpenſable "duty on the part of an hiſtorical writer," [6] again to have alleged the *opinion* of the Magiſtrates that the Chriſtians of Rome were poſſeſſed of very conſiderable wealth, [7] yet again, not to have added from the ſame teſtimony that this opinion proved

[4] Remarks, p. 67—71.
[5] See p. 18 of this Reply.
[6] Advertiſement, Vol. I.
[7] Vol. II. Note 134.

falſe in the event, the expected treaſures not having been found. [8]

Can it be ſaid alſo that a faithful ſtate of the caſe is exhibited, or that the ſuppoſed difficulty with reſpect to the ſilence of two diſtinguiſhed Naturaliſts as to the darkneſs of the Paſſion, is *fairly* urged, when it is again aſſerted, that both Seneca and Pliny "have recorded all the great phenomena of nature, earthquakes, meteors, comets, and eclipſes, which their indefatigable curioſity could collect?" [9] For in fact, as was pointed out to our Author, [1] it does not appear that Seneca has collected any account of *Eclipſes*. As little ſeemingly ſhould it be again aſſerted, that "a *diſtinct* Chapter of Pliny is *devoted* to *Eclipſes* of an extraordinary nature and unuſual duration," when it had been ſhewn that in reality this *diſtinct* Chapter

[8] Remarks, p. 123.
[9] Vol. II. p. 379.
[1] Remarks, p. 163.

conſiſts

conſiſts only of *three* lines, and inſtances only in *one* ſingle præternatural darkneſs. [2] It may be added that our Author's deſcription of the darkneſs at the Paſſion as "the greateſt phenomenon to which the "mortal eye has been witneſs ſince the "creation of the globe," [3] might well have ſeemed alſo, for the purpoſe of ſtating the fact more truly and correctly, to require that ſoftening which it yet has not received, after the charge of much exaggeration had been ſo plainly fixed upon it, in the remarks of Dr. Watſon. [4]

In theſe ſeveral inſtances then (and others alſo have been omitted) we ſee our Author wholly ſilent as to each objection, as to each diſtinct error pointed out, yet proudly retaining every error as before, and diſdaining to correct his Hiſtory, however faulty and fallacious.

[2] Remarks, p. 164.
[3] Vol. II. p. 379.
[4] Letter V.

Some

Some little regard has been paid indeed to the animadverſions of Mr. Wynne (contained in the Appendix to Dr. Watſon's Letters) on our Author's tranſlation of the remarkable paſſage of Tacitus, by ſubſtituting the expreſſion of "public welfare" [5] in the place of "the rigour of juſtice," as the true rendering of "utilitate pub-"licâ," and by adding a note in defence of that ſenſe of the phraſe, "odio humani "generis," which is ſtill retained. [6] No

[5] Vol. II. p. 404.

[6] Our Author allows the words capable of the ſenſe which Mr. Wynne has contended for, as well as his own, but adds, that he has preferred the latter of the two ſenſes, "as the moſt agreeable to the ſtyle "of Tacitus, and to the popular error, of which a "precept of the Goſpel (Luke XIV. 26.) had been, "perhaps, the innocent occaſion." (Vol. II. p. 405. n. 32.) It may be ſtill a queſtion whether this "po-"pular error" reſpecting the ſuppoſed hatred of the Chriſtians towards mankind did in reality obtain; but it is at leaſt ſurely to attribute to the enemies of the Chriſtians far too intimate a knowledge of the

notice

notice however is taken of two other apparent miſ-tranſlations, ſeemingly of no

writings of their religion to ſuppoſe that they ſhould have been acquainted with this particular text. And is it not probable that whatever their prejudiced idea of the Chriſtians might have been, or whenceſoever derived, it would rather have been that of their hating all *others*, agreeably to the idea which Tacitus entertained of the Jews, (Hiſt. V. 4.) than of their "hating" (according to that literal interpretation of the word, which even common ſenſe, as well as the parallel text of St. Mathew, 10. 37. and the general precepts of the Goſpel, ſeemingly forbids) "their "*own* parents and families," as expreſſed in the text? And I cannot but think that Mr. Wynne's appeal to the expreſſion "per flagitia inviſos," affords an argugument on his ſide from Tacitus his ſelf. See alſo an appoſite quotation from Tertullian, concerning the Chriſtians, "Sed iſtud ſolum expectatur quod ODIO PUBLICO neceſſarium eſt, &c." (Taylor on the Grand Apoſtacy, p. 141.)

I ought to add that our Author has ſo far attended to one of my objections as to omit the word "eternal" in ſpeaking of "the condemnation pronounced againſt "human kind," (Remarks, p. 32) but he has ſtill retained the epithet "venial" in deſcribing "the "offence of our firſt progenitors," altho' it was an

ſmall

ſmall import; [7] and that improbable and extraordinary defence of Nero ſtill forms a part of our Author's Hiſtory, of which Mr. Wynne may not be thought to have expreſſed his ſelf too ſtrongly, when he obſerves that "a perſon who by a pre-"tended inveſtigation of truth endeavours "to explain away *a notorious matter of fact*, "recorded by a contemporary and ſeveral "ſucceeding hiſtorians, hardly deſerves a "ſerious anſwer." [8] We meet alſo in our Author's obſervations on this account of Nero's perſecution with the ſame refined ſuppoſitions, and the ſame vague

offence committed in defiance of the expreſs command of God, delivered by his ſelf. (Vol. II. p. 283.)

[7] Theſe are, the rendering "per flagitia inviſos" by the expreſſion "branded with *deſerved* infamy;" and the words "qui fatebantur" as importing a confeſſion of the *crime*, not of their being *Chriſtians*. According to this latter ſenſe, "who confeſſed their "ſelves of that *ſect*," are the words of Lardner in his verſion of the paſſage.

[8] Appendix to Dr. Watſon's Letters, p. 274.

con-

conjectures, as before, although they are founded on no real authority, and attended with very material difficulties. [9]

What name ought in reality to be given to our Author's conduct in the inſtances alluded to, I will not particularly enquire, altho' I am abſolved certainly from every peculiar feeling either of pity or of delicacy on the occaſion, by the ſtile of his own Vindication. I ſhall leave it to my readers to adopt every one for his ſelf ſuch reflections as may naturally ariſe; and ſhall content myſelf with the ſatisfaction of having laboured in the defence of truth, without wiſhing to dwell on theſe errors of my antagoniſt, which can no longer be ſuppoſed accidental, but are plainly wilful.

One remarkable inſtance of determined fallacy I cannot however paſs by without particular notice.

The important and unfeeling accuſation exhibited againſt Euſebius on the mere

[9] Remarks, p. 174—180.

ground of arbitrary ſuppoſition, is ſtill retained, even after the criticiſm alleged in ſupport of it has been ſhewn to involve the moſt palpable inconſiſtency. [1] Mr. Gibbon has obſerved in his own behalf, with reſpect to a charge of Mr. Davis's, that "*falſifying* is a very ſerious word;" [2] he might have reflected alſo, that to accuſe an hiſtorian of "artful management," of "chuſing the ſcene" [3] of his narrative, of "ſelecting moſt artfully two ambiguous "words," and "thus providing a ſecure "evaſion," [4] is a *ſerious* accuſation alſo, ſuch as ſhould not at firſt have been exhibited on the mere ground of opinion, ſuch as ſhould ſtill leſs have been retained afterwards unſupported by any real proof, and confuted by it's own glaring inconſiſtency. That Euſebius his ſelf *choſe* the ſcene of Thebais, that it was not *really* the ſcene of

[1] Remarks, p. 220—225.
[2] Vindication, p. 44.
[3] Vol. II. p. 493. Note 182.
[4] Ibid.

the

the facts which he relates, Mr. Gibbon has not even attempted to ſhew. And in his criticiſm reſpecting the two words ſuppoſed *deſignedly* ambiguous, he has been ſingularly unfortunate. It appears, with reſpect to one (ἱστορησαμεν) that even either ſenſe may ſuffice to give credibility to the Hiſtorian's narrative. [5] Of the other (ὑπομειναντας) it appears that one of the two ſenſes attributed to it, (and the other ſenſe eſtabliſhes the fact in queſtion) cannot be applied to the text without making the Hiſtorian ſpeak (far too *abſurdly* to allow us in any ſort to admit the ſuppoſition) of "many "*expecting* to be beheaded, ſo that the "murderer's ſword became blunted, and "unable to perform it's office, and the "executioners their ſelves, thro' fatigue, "ſucceeded one another by turns;" [6] and of other Martyrs *expecting*, and only ex-

[5] Remarks, p. 221.
[6] Ibid, p. 223.

pecting to ſuffer, of whom it is at the ſame time poſitively aſſerted, that ſome were *drowned*, ſome *ſtarved*, ſome *burnt*, and ſome *crucified*. [7] Yet ſtrange as it may ſeem, our Author has choſen to retain his licentious and unwarrantable cenſure on Euſebius, even at the expence of ſubjecting his ſelf anew to the ſhame of ſo ſingular and ſo triumphant a refutation. One knows not in the preſent caſe which to be moſt aſtoniſhed at, our Author's unbecoming confidence either in the inattention or the lenity of his readers,—his neglect of his own reputation,—or the wantonneſs and boldneſs of his attack on that of another.

On looking back now on my paſt labours, I ſhall not, with our Author, expreſs my mortification and regret at having dedicated ſo many hours to ſuch purſuits. In one reſpect only will I call the contro-

[7] Remarks, p. 225.

verſy

verſy "odious," and grieve that my time has not been more profitably ſpent, when I reflect that the nature of Mr. Gibbon's Vindication has neceſſarily led to the introduction of ſome matter in my Reply which may ſeem to relate rather to ourſelves only, than to the immediate ſubject of our diſquiſitions. In ſuch inſtances however I truſt that I have exerciſed only the natural rights of ſelf-defence, and have been influenced only by the common feelings of human nature. As to the reſt, I rejoice certainly in the thought of having endeavoured humbly to vindicate Religion, and to reſtore to Hiſtory it's genuine colours, in inſtances in which our ingenious but deceitful Artiſt has frequently miſapplied both his lights and ſhades, both the dark and the enlivening tints of his pencil. I am compelled to entertain the ſame ſentiments of my Antagoniſt, as he has been pleaſed to declare that he his ſelf entertains

of

of his own Adverſaries. [8] He might certainly have deſerved "eſteem," had he candidly and ingenuouſly retracted thoſe miſrepreſentations which he has not been able to defend. But I cannot now conſider him either as "an object of eſteem," [9] or indeed "of terror," ſince he can boaſt no ſuperiority in reaſoning, but excels only in

[8] Vindication, p. 145.

[9] A collection of a great part of the works of my late reſpectable Collegue, which has appeared in two vol. 8vo. ſince the firſt part of theſe ſheets was printed off, will not fail at leaſt to attract "the eſteem" of others, if not of Mr. Gibbon.—The reader will find in theſe volumes much ſolid and valuable learning, joined to a very extenſive and accurate knowledge of the Scriptures. They are the fruits indeed of a long life uniformly ſpent in the ſtudy, in the defence, and in the practice of Religion. A complete liſt of Dr. Randolph's works is prefixed.—Dr. Randolph cloſed his own publications, but one year before his death, by a very uſeful compariſon of the Prophecies and other Texts cited in the New Teſtament, with the Hebrew Original, and with the Verſion of the Seventy.

the

the keenneſs of his wit, the livelineſs of his irony, and the poignancy of his raillery. In theſe reſpects I willingly yield the palm. The exerciſe of theſe talents belongs not to ingenuous controverſy, nor to ſound and rational diſquiſition. And the conſciouſneſs of a good cauſe, and of having obeyed the call of very ſolemn obligations, might eaſily have taught me to deſpiſe invectives even more perſonal, and wit even more pointed. On the other hand, I do not derive any joy from the advantages I have gained over my adverſary; not certainly, becauſe it might not be eſteemed matter of great triumph to have overcome "the "Hiſtorian of the Roman Empire," [1] but becauſe I have never in reality in any moment ſought for victory, or triumph, but for truth only; and have but laboured to fulfil what I eſteemed a ſacred Duty.

[1] Vindication, p. 101.

I have

I have now little more to add reſpecting Mr. Gibbon's Hiſtory. Having diſdained to correct ſo many errors which he has been unable to defend, it had been well had the ſubſequent volumes of his work been found in no ſort liable to objection. I am compelled to think of them far otherwiſe. There may be found in them, on due examination, much of the ſame ſpecies of poiſon as infected the former volume; much apparent ſpirit of prejudice, and much ſeeming eagerneſs to relate whatever may reflect either ridicule or diſgrace upon the primitive Church. It was therefore originally my deſign to have entered into a large diſcuſſion of ſeveral paſſages in theſe volumes, having prepared materials for that purpoſe. I am now induced from ſeveral different circumſtances to abandon my deſign. Yet it has ſeemed right to make ſome mention of the continuation of our Author's Hiſtory; and I cannot

cannot but add alſo a few words reſpecting the ſpirit of modern Philoſophy, and it's apparent conſequent effects, as it ſtands delineated even by our Author his ſelf.

It differs indeed widely from the pure ſpirit of the Philoſophy of the Goſpel. Chriſtian charity "REJOICETH NOT IN "INIQUITY," [2] and reaſon itſelf ſeems to inſtruct us to grieve at the vices of others. But when "the licentiouſneſs of "the degenerate monks, who embraced "the vain and *ſenſual* pleaſures of the "world which they had renounced," [3] is ſpoken of by our indulgent Hiſtorian, he can remark coolly, that "their *natural* "deſcent from ſuch painful and dangerous "virtue to the *common vices* of huma-"nity will not perhaps excite much grief "or indignation in the mind of *a Philo-"ſopher.*" [4]

[2] 1 Cor. xiii. 6.
[3] Vol. VI. p. 259.
[4] Vol. VI. p. 260.

The ſame features of *philoſophic morality* are again diſplayed even more openly and deciſively in another paſſage reſpecting the conduct of Honoria, which has been duly expoſed by a late very ſpirited and learned writer. [5] We may collect from this *inſtructive* page of Hiſtory, that to apply the expreſſions of "guilt and ſhame" to female proſtitution, is to uſe "the abſurd "language of imperious man." I may properly place by the ſide of this paſſage another remark of our Author's alſo, in which he ſeems again to have adopted a very indulgent ſyſtem of morality, when he is of opinion that the "*theſts* of li-"centious love might be leſs pernicious to "mankind than the theological diſputes "of the Sorbonne, which have ſince been "agitated on the ſame ground." [6]

[5] See Mr. Travis's letters to Mr. Gibbon, p. 358. 2d edit. 8vo.

[6] Vol. IV. p. 10. Note 7.

After

After theſe and other ſeeming inſtances of the effects of our Author's Philoſophy, I am not indeed grieved that the Theological and Philoſophic characters are conſidered by him as generally inconſiſtent. I muſt on the contrary wiſh earneſtly that the "Theologien Philoſophe," according to our Author's uſe of the words, may ſtill remain, what he wittily ſtiles the character, "a ſtrange Centaur." [7]

I am neceſſarily led to think further indeed that ſuch Philoſophy, which muſt certainly be inconſiſtent with true Theology, is in reality alſo very ill adapted to the proper ends of Hiſtorical compoſition. It were on the whole better to conſign this province even to the moſt artleſs and unornamented writers, who might be perhaps willing to attend rather to the relation of facts than to the introduction of their own opinions, and who, as one of great authority

[7] Vol. IV. p. 81. Note 31.

has remarked, are uſually moſt to be depended on. [8] It has been ſeen, in a variety of inſtances, how far the Philoſophic Hiſtorian may err his ſelf, and may in conſequence deceive others.

[8] "The moſt dry and artleſs hiſtorians are in "general the moſt authentic. They who colour and "embelliſh have the leaſt regard for truth."
(Bryant's Analyſis of Ancient Mythology. Vol. I. p. 146.)

FINIS.

Lately publiſhed,

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

REMARKS on the Two LAST CHAPTERS of Mr. GIBBON's HISTORY of the DECLINE and FALL of the ROMAN EMPIRE.—Price 2s. 6d.

The CHARACTER of the LAWS of ENGLAND Conſidered. A SERMON preached at the Aſſizes at OXFORD. Publiſhed at the Requeſt of the Judges.—Quarto, Price 1s.